

The Educational Record

Volume I

JANUARY-DECEMBER

1920



PUBLISHED BY

The American Council on Education

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Index to Volume I

- Accredited Higher Institutions, pp. 71-85.
- Adams, Elizabeth K., "Some New Professional Standards for College Women," pp. 54-60.
- American Council on Education, pp. 38.
- American Council on Education, pp. 88.
- American Council on Education, pp. 139.
- American Council on Education, Annual Meeting of, May, 1920, pp. 141-172.
- American Council on Education, Organization for 1920-21, pp. 179-181.
- American and French Degrees and Certificates, Equivalence of, pp. 136-137.
- Budget, 1920-21, p. 157.
- Capen, S. P., Educational Bills before Congress, pp. 3-29.
- Capen, S. P., Pending Federal Legislation, pp. 41-49.
- Comments on the Smith-Towner Bill, Arthur T. Hadley, pp. 105-106.
- Committee on Federal Legislation, Report of, pp. 91-95.
- Committee Reports, Annual Meeting, 1920, pp. 141-172.
- Degrees, Equivalence of French and American, pp. 136-137.
- Department of Education and Science, Wm. F. Willoughby, pp. 107-117.
- Director's Report, pp. 143-154.
- Director's Budget, 1920-21, p. 157.
- Education and Science, Department of, Wm. F. Willoughby, pp. 107-117.
- Education, National Problems in, Chas. H. Judd, pp. 118-131.
- Educational Bills before Congress, S. P. Capen, pp. 3-29.
- Education and Universal Training, C. R. Mann, pp. 50-53.
- Equivalence of French and American Degrees and Certificates, pp. 136-137.
- Federal Education Office, General Staff Functions of, C. R. Mann, pp. 132-135.

- Federal Legislation, Pending, S. P. Capen, pp. 41-49.
 Federal Legislation, Report of Committee on, pp. 91-95.
 French and American Degrees and Certificates, Equivalence of, pp. 136-137.
- Hadley, Arthur T., "Comments on the Smith-Towner Bill," pp. 105-106.
- Institutions, Accredited Higher, pp. 71-85.
- Judd, Chas. H., "National Problems in Education," pp. 118-131.
- Lovejoy, A. O., "University Problems," pp. 61-70.
- MacCracken, John H., "Report of the Committee on Federal Legislation," pp. 91-95.
- Mann, C. R., "Education and Universal Training," pp. 50-53.
 Mann, C. R., "The General Staff Functions of a Federal Education Office," pp. 132-135.
- National Problems in Education, Chas. H. Judd, pp. 118-131.
- Operation of the Smith-Lever Act and Its Bearing on Future Educational Legislation, A. F. Woods, pp. 175-178.
- Problems in Education, National, Chas. H. Judd., pp. 118-131.
 Problems, University, A. O. Lovejoy, pp. 61-70.
- Science and Education, Department of, Wm. F. Willoughby, pp. 107-117.
- Smith-Lever Act, Operation of and Its Bearing on Future Educational Legislation, A. F. Woods, pp. 175-178.
- Smith-Towner Bill, Geo. D. Strayer, pp. 96-104.
 Smith-Towner Bill, Comments on, Arthur T. Hadley, pp. 105-106.
 Staff, General, Functions of a Federal Education Office, C. R. Mann, pp. 132-135.
- Standards for College Women, Professional, E. K. Adams, pp. 54-60.
 Strayer, George D., "The Smith-Towner Bill," pp. 96-104.
- Treasurer's Report, pp. 155-156.
- Universal and Education Training, C. R. Mann, pp. 50-53.
 University Problems, Arthur O. Lovejoy, pp. 61-70.

- War Plans Division, War Department, Letter from Director of, pp. 173-174.
- Willoughby, W. F., "A Federal Department of Education and Science," pp. 107-117.
- Women, College, Professional Standards for, E. K. Adams, pp. 54-60.
- Woods, A. F., "The Operation of the Smith-Lever Act and Its Bearing on Future Educational Legislation, pp. 175-178.

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly by

The American Council on Education

Volume 1

January, 1920

No. 1

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

Educational Bills Before Congress

By the Editor

The American Council on Education

By the Editor

Annual Subscription, \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1920
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Educational Bills Before Congress

THE tendency to bring education within the scope of Congressional legislation is increasing. While the control of education is still admitted to be the function of the States and not of the Federal Government, one measure after another has found its way onto the statute books which tends to break down the integrity of this theory. By accretion we are getting a nationalized system of education, more and more influenced, if not actually controlled by the Federal Government. This trend is exemplified in the Smith-Lever Act for agricultural extension, in the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education and in numerous bills now before Congress.

Should we have, within well defined limits, Federal control of education? Or are Federal influence and leadership without administrative authority what should be sought? Are large Federal subsidies necessary for the development of important phases of education? If not necessary, are such subsidies desirable as a stimulation to local effort? How large must a Federal subsidy be in order to stimulate the development of any particular phase of education? Should Federal funds be appropriated to States for educational purposes only on condition that the States raise additional sums for the same purposes? If so, should the States be required to match Federal funds dollar for dollar as in the Vocational Educational Act, and in various other measures now pending, or should the States' contributions be larger or smaller? Should the ultimate control of cooperative enterprises supported jointly by Federal and State funds be vested in the Federal Government? What would be the effect of a three to six months period of universal military training on the educational system of the country? Would such a training period automatically extend the authority of the Federal Government over education in the States? Should the military arm of the Government have full control of a system of universal training? Have the Government's legitimate educational functions become so numerous and complicated as to demand a different kind of

administrative machinery to deal with them? If so, what shall the machinery be—a department, a board, or a well equipped bureau?

One or another of the foregoing questions has been raised from time to time in the past and never definitely settled. Now all of them are raised at once. A decision of some sort in regard to nearly every one of them impends. If possible, it must be the right decision. The situation therefore demands that both statesmen and educators give these questions immediate attention.

They are raised—and many other serious questions of policy are raised also—by pending Federal legislation. There are more than 70 bills and joint resolutions bearing in some fashion upon education now before Congress. The situation is unique. Obviously it is the result of the war. The great lacks suddenly exposed by the war, the lack of technical skill on the artisan level, the lack of physical fitness, the lack of knowledge of the English language, were at bottom due to defective educational provisions. Statesmen are awake to these facts now and are properly eager to remove these sources of national weakness. Hence, the prominent place education has come to occupy in the deliberations of Congress. Not all of the 70 or more bills are important, to be sure. Some are quite trivial. Nevertheless, there are approximately 20 measures which involve large issues of Federal policy and which would affect the development of education in the United States in significant ways.

A digest of all the bills that have more than local bearing is presented in the following pages. The more obvious implications of each major legislative proposal are pointed out. There is no attempt to take sides on any issue. No answer is suggested to any of the questions enumerated above. Discussion of these questions and of the merits and defects of the more important bills is reserved for later issues of this Record. It is believed that relatively few persons outside of Congress are aware either of the multiplicity of the legislative proposals, or of the manifest consequences which certain of them would entail if enacted into law. The primary purpose of this article is to acquaint the educational public with the basic facts of this complicated situation. This digest constitutes part of the work of the Committee on Federal Legislation of the American Council on Education. The Committee proposes, on the basis of a careful analysis of existing and proposed governmental efforts in the field of education, to

formulate and submit to the interests most concerned a program for the participation of the Federal Government in the educational affairs of the nation.

Pending Congressional bills affecting education may be grouped under several heads, for example, military bills; bills creating new departments; Bureau of Education bills; Federal Board for Vocational Education bills; new service bills, etc. The measures that should first receive the attention of the educational interests are undoubtedly the military bills. Their claim to immediate consideration lies, not only in the far-reaching effects which some of them would have, if passed, but also in the fact that comprehensive legislation in this sphere is imminent. The Army must be reorganized. Prominent interests are insisting that the reorganization plan include universal training in some form. Others desire the assistance of civilian institutions on a large scale in the training of officers and men. All of the military measures that have either strong political or strong popular backing contain training features that involve the educational system of the country.

MILITARY BILLS WITH EDUCATIONAL FEATURES

Three prominent proposals relating to universal military training were still pending when the present session of Congress opened. These were, (a) the provision for three months universal training in the so-called War Department Bill; (b) the Chamberlain-Kahn Bill which provided for a universal training period of six months and for the inclusion of vocational training in appropriate trades as well as military training; and (c) the Frelinghuysen-Hull or National Guard Bill which, while defining the organization and functions of the National Guard, provided also for a scheme of military training to be carried on in elementary schools, high schools and colleges under the general direction of the National Guard Council. One of these, the Chamberlain-Kahn Bill, has received wide publicity and the vigorous support of various defense societies and educational organizations. The others are less well known.

All three measures have now been displaced by the Wadsworth bill, S. 3688. The authors of this bill maintain that it includes the principal features of the Chamberlain-Kahn bill, to-

gether with the best elements of the other two bills, modified in details as the result of hearings. The numerous public hearings that were held by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, particularly on the Chamberlain-Kahn Bill, are judged to have met the needs for expression of the different groups concerned. No further public hearings on the Wadsworth Bill are contemplated by the Committee. Persons desirous of bringing their views on this measure before the Committee or the Senate must now do so in writing. The bill is outlined below. Attention is especially called to paragraphs 6 to 15, inclusive, and paragraph 22.

THE ARMY REORGANIZATION BILL

S. 3688

1. Establishes a single Army with
 - a. Overseas garrisons;
 - b. A small home force for minor emergencies;
 - c. A training establishment;
 - d. A citizen Army including—
 - (1) Organized Reserves.
 - (2) The National Guard.
2. The reserves will consist of officers and men of the World War who volunteer. They will be renewed by the young men who finish training.
3. The National Guard will be organized as now provided by law. Within the limits of the authorized strength of the National Guard young men liable to training may elect training in the Guard instead of in the Training camps.
4. An expert General Staff composed of men trained for the service and drawn from an eligible list is created.
5. An Undersecretary of War with assistants is provided for, to have charge of business and industrial problems.
6. The Secretary of War may detail up to two per cent. of the commissioned officers as students at educational institutions or as students, observers, or investigators at industrial plants and hospitals.
7. Four months of compulsory military training, beginning normally in the nineteenth year, but subject to deferment one, two or three years, are required of all physically and mentally fit males. Under regulations to be prescribed by the President, the period may be extended for any individual with his consent two months longer.
8. On induction men will be subjected to physical and psychological examinations to determine whether their training should be for combatant or non-combatant service.
9. Military training will include vocational training in appropriate trades, useful in civil life, including agriculture. It will be adapted to the respective climatic, agricultural, industrial, and educational conditions of the areas of the country where it is given.

10. All regulations governing training will be in the hands of a branch of the General Staff, including among its members at least half who are reserve officers or practical and experienced civilian educators or physicians.

11. Persons not sufficiently instructed in the English language will be required to receive such preparatory education as may be necessary.

12. After the training period, membership in the organized reserves will be for five years with compulsory manœuvres of two weeks each year.

13. Those who elect training and service in the National Guard must be enrolled for five years.

14. The organized reserves are subject to service only in an emergency declared by Congress.

15. Until the military training system becomes effective the citizen Army will be constituted of volunteers who served in the World War. The organization of the personnel of this force is provided for in detail.

16. The organization of the National Guard will conform to the organization of the organized reserves.

17. The strength of the regular Army is set at 18,000 officers and 280,000 enlisted men. Their assignment and reassignment from one branch of the service to another is provided for. Promotions of officers will be made from a single promotion list based on length of service.

18. To make up the number of officers and men needed for all purposes 6,000 reserve officers and 20,000 reservists are to be added to the regular Army on the volunteer basis.

19. A method of ridding the service of inefficient officers and promoting only the fit is prescribed.

20. To carry out the system of training, all males are required to register after attaining the age of seventeen years. The machinery of registration provided by the Act of May 18, 1917, is to be reapplied.

21. In an emergency the National Guard and the reserves are subject to call for immediate service, as are also all other males between eighteen and forty-five. Provision is made for classifying men liable for service and for the creation of deferred classes.

22. The Reserve Officers Training Corps is continued at civil educational institutions with two slight modifications. (1) Staff Corps units may be maintained with a minimum enrolment of fifty men. (2) Members of the Reserve Officers Training Corps attending advanced camps are to receive the pay of a cadet of the United States Military Academy.

It is clear that the Wadsworth Bill would have a very profound effect upon American educational practice. Attention is called especially to these features of it:

a. It adopts the principle of compulsory military service for the purpose of training.

b. It provides at Government expense for the vocational training of all males carried on under Government control.

c. It makes the War Department responsible for the education

for a period of from four to six months of all the men in the country. A fraction of the membership of the controlling committee, but evidently a minority, will be composed of civilian educators. The selection will be wholly in the hands of the War Department.

d. There is no requirement that civilian training agencies shall be used in providing vocational training. The presumption is that the Army will set up educational equipment and employ its own educational personnel. At least 20,000 teachers will be required to carry on the vocational and general education.

e. Such a measure would take the majority of college students out of college for one semester. Membership in the R. O. T. C. would not absolve a man from military training. The elementary portion of the R. O. T. C. would therefore probably lapse in the course of time.

f. Approximately 750,000 men a year will be under training. The annual cost will be between \$300,000,000 and \$400,000,000.

The Committee on Military Affairs of the House has in preparation a measure of its own relating to Army reorganization. It is understood to contain no provision for universal military training.

There are four other military training measures which have special interest for higher institutions. These are the McKellar-Howard Bill, the Sears Bill, the Poindexter Bill and the Harrison Bill.

THE MCKELLAR-HOWARD BILL FOR MILITARY TRAINING COLLEGES

S. 472 and H. R. 3405

1. Provides for the establishment of an educational and military training institution in each State, to be known as The Military Training College of such State. After the second year, each military training college must have not less than 300 students.

2. The educational affairs of the colleges are to be under the control of the trustees and faculties. Military training will be under officers detailed by the War Department, and the existing limitation on the number of officers that may be detailed to educational institutions is abrogated.

3. Each State Legislature is to designate an institution of the State, or establish one, to receive the benefits of the Act. If the

State Legislature fails within reasonable time to act, any institution in the State may apply, provided it can guarantee 300 students a year for military training, an income of \$40,000 a year for the military department, and will agree to house, feed and instruct its students properly and free of charge, and will give a course of study approximating that of West Point. If any institution not exclusively military is designated, the military feature must be separated from the other activities of the institution.

4. Students between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one are to be selected by competitive examination from each county by the County Superintendents, or, in the absence of such officers, by the State Superintendents of Education. The bill specifies the subjects for entrance, namely, reading, writing, English grammar, United States history, general geography, arithmetic, and the first principles of algebra. The course of study in the colleges is to be such as is given by other first-class colleges and the institutions are authorized to grant bachelors' degrees. Students must promise to serve in the Army on call for seven years after graduation. In this period they may be required to attend three summer camps of four weeks each.

5. Three million eight hundred and forty thousand dollars, or \$80,000 for each State, is appropriated to maintain the colleges.

6. Although the course of study and the discipline and organization of the students are to be modeled as closely as possible upon those of West Point, the Administrative Board may prescribe vocational training in addition to, or in lieu of, any portion of the regular training.

7. Graduates are to be transferred at once to the Army Officers Reserve Corps.

8. A Board consisting of the Secretary of War, an officer of the Army and a civilian to be appointed by the President at a salary of \$6,000, is created to administer the Act.

10. Allotments of money to each institution are to be on the basis of an expense of \$400 a year for each boy for maintenance and education.

Certain educational and administrative results that would follow the passage of this bill will at once strike college officers. The State Legislatures would undoubtedly in the majority of instances designate State institutions, either land grant colleges or State universities, as the military training colleges of the States. With respect to the military department, then, these institutions would be subject to the regulations prescribed by a new Federal board. The board is specifically charged with the duty of regulating the admission of students. As far as the course of instruction and discipline deviates from that of West Point, the board is also authorized to prescribe the subjects which shall compose it. The

result would be a larger measure of control exercised by a Washington board than is now exercised by the central administrative agencies under either the Smith-Lever or the Smith-Hughes Acts. Moreover, the board has power to standardize a considerable portion of American higher education. The minimum standards set forth in the bill itself are obviously not high ones. The bill evidently contemplates the abolition of the R. O. T. C., which is rendered superfluous by its provisions.

THE SEARS BILL FOR THE PROMOTION OF MILITARY TRAINING

H. R. 553

1. Appropriates \$75,000,000 a year, \$50,000,000 to provide scholarships at public higher institutions for not to exceed 250,000 students, and \$25,000,000 to assist the institutions in the payment of salaries and the expenses of equipment and maintenance.

2. Each beneficiary is to receive a scholarship of \$200 a year. Institutions are to receive \$100 a year for each scholarship holder in attendance.

3. A Federal Board of Military Training consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Education is created to administer the Act. It is to apportion the scholarships among the States in the proportion that the number of males sixteen to twenty years of age in each State bears to the total male population of the United States between the ages of sixteen and twenty.

4. State authorities are to apportion the scholarships among the counties in the proportion that the number of males sixteen to twenty bears to the total male population of the State between these ages. Graduates from high schools will be entitled to scholarships in the order in which they pass their final examinations.

5. The Legislatures of the several States are to designate publicly supported and controlled institutions to receive the benefits of this Act. The training at such institutions must conform as nearly as practicable to the rules and regulations of West Point, but in any event military instruction must be at least seven hours a week for four years. States receiving the benefits of this Act must appropriate \$50 for each student holding a scholarship, to be made over to him for use in part payment for board and clothing. The States must also appropriate funds sufficient for adequate instruction in the institutions designated.

6. One officer of the regular Army is to be detailed for each 500 students or fraction thereof. The War Department is to furnish uniforms and equipment. The officers are to be in full control of military affairs. Educational affairs are to be under the management of the Presidents of the institutions.

7. Each scholarship holder must sign an obligation to serve the United States in war for a period based on the length of time he holds a scholarship, up to six years.

8. \$250,000 is appropriated annually for administration.

9. There is specifically reserved to each State the right to regulate its own public institutions. The Federal Board for Military Training will regulate only the *military* features.

This bill provides for maintaining on scholarships in publicly supported and controlled institutions nearly twice as many men as were enrolled in all types of higher institutions, public and private, in 1916-17. It is evidently not designed solely to provide for the training of officers, because assuming that only ten per cent of the total enrollment graduated each year—and the percentage is generally higher—it would produce 25,000 officers a year. That this number is far in excess of the needs is shown by a reference to the number of officers provided for in the Wadsworth bill. Manifestly this measure and the Wadsworth bill are mutually exclusive. The Sears bill assumes the continuance the voluntary system of military training and service in peace times. The Wadsworth bill does not. The Sears bill and the McKellar-Howard bill are also alternative propositions. The McKellar-Howard bill is a measure for the training of officers through State institutions. The Sears bill contemplates the use of many of the same institutions for Government supported military training, but, in spite of the West Point regime which it prescribes, it leaves the subsequent military status of the graduates undetermined. The McKellar-Howard bill calls for an annual expenditure of \$3,840,000 and the Sears bill for \$75,000,000. The McKellar-Howard bill makes its appropriation direct to the States, leaving each State to determine how it will secure the required enrollment at the military training institutions. The Sears bill apportions two-thirds of the total appropriation to individual beneficiaries and in addition appropriates larger sums to the institutions than would accrue to them under the McKellar-Howard bill.

The effect which the passage of the Sears bill would have on the privately-supported colleges is easily surmised. The designated public institutions will receive from the Federal Government \$100 for each scholarship student. In addition the States are required to support the institutions satisfactorily in order to receive the Federal moneys. From combined Federal and State

sources each scholarship holder receives \$250 a year, and there are more than enough scholarships for all the men who have in any previous year manifested a desire to go to college. It should be noted that the board designated to administer the undertaking is a new Federal ex-officio board.

THE POINDEXTER BILL FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE WYOMING PLAN OF MILITARY AND PHYSICAL TRAINING

S. 382

The bill authorizes the Secretary of War upon request of the Governor of any State to detail Army officers to cooperate with the school authorities of such State in establishing and conducting the Wyoming plan of physical and military training and discipline prepared by Lieutenant E. Z. Steever, and to furnish military supplies for the use of the pupils.

This is permissive legislation. It throws the burden of decision on the State authorities and provides Government cooperation at their request. No Government control features are included.

THE HARRISON BILL FOR MILITARY TRAINING

H. R. 4095

It authorizes the Secretary of War to furnish military equipment to such colleges and secondary schools as may apply for it and to detail officers to act as military instructors.

Like the Poindexter bill, this bill leaves the initiative with local educational authorities. It merely authorizes Government cooperation.

BILLS CREATING NEW FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS

Of still greater interest to the educational public, perhaps of greater moment in the end to the country, are the legislative proposals for the creation of new Departments. The best known of these is the Smith-Towner bill.

THE SMITH-TOWNER BILL FOR A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

S. 1017 and H. R. 7

1. Creates a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet and an Assistant Secretary.

2. Transfers to the Department of Education the Bureau of Education and authorizes the President to transfer such other offices and bureaus as in his judgment should be controlled by the Department of Education.

3. Authorizes the Department to conduct investigations and studies in the field of education and report thereon, and appropriates the sum of \$500,000 annually for purposes of investigation and administration.

4. Appropriates \$100,000,000 annually to cooperate with the States in promoting education, to be disbursed as follows:

- a. Three-fortieths to remove illiteracy;
- b. Three-fortieths for Americanization;
- c. Five-tenths for the payment of teachers' salaries and the extension of school terms especially in rural localities. Specifies, however, certain minimum requirements.
- d. Two-tenths for physical education;
- e. Three-twentieths for the preparation of teachers of rural schools.

5. To receive the benefits of the Act a State must appropriate an equal sum or money.

6. Each State must report its plans to the Secretary of Education. The money is to be paid when the reports show that the State is prepared to carry out the provisions of the Act. But the administration of educational facilities fostered by the foregoing provisions is to be in the hands of local educational authorities.

The Smith-Towner bill has received so much publicity and has been the subject of such spirited debate that comment on the effect it would have on the development of American education is perhaps superfluous. Three points should, however, be made, not as criticisms but by way of analysis. They have thus far received little emphasis. (1) The bill is a double measure. One-half of it provides for the establishment of a Department of Education, the other for the Federal subsidization of education in the States. These propositions are not necessarily related to one another. (2) It perpetuates on an immense scale the principle of dollar for dollar appropriations with final Federal approval of the projects for which the combined Federal and State appropriations are spent. This principle is still on trial. Its universal validity is by no means proved. (3) The subsidy feature of the bill appears not to differentiate between Federal stimulation of new educational movements and Federal support of the general educational enterprise of the States.

The Kenyon bill for Americanization which has just passed

the Senate (see page 19) embodies the features of the Smith-Towner bill relating to Americanization and illiteracy.

THE OWEN BILL FOR A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION S. 819

1. Creates a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet and an Assistant Secretary and transfers to it the Bureau of Education.

2. Provides for an appropriation sufficient to carry out the purposes of the Department, which are: "To collect, classify and disseminate information and advice on all phases of education and through cooperation with the State, County, district and municipal educational officers to promote, foster and develop advancement and improvement in the public school system throughout the United States."

The Owen bill antedates the Smith-Towner bill and has been several times introduced. It provides for the transfer to the new Department only of the Bureau of Education. As a consolidation measure, therefore, it does not even go as far as the Smith-Towner bill toward bringing the thirty-odd educational offices of the Government under one direction. Like the first portion of the Smith-Towner bill, its purpose is to add dignity and prestige to the Government's principal education office.

THE JONES-REAVIS BILL TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS S. 2232 and H. R. 6649

1. Changes the name of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Public Works, the head of said Department to be known as the Secretary of Public Works and all future incumbents of the office to be fitted by training and experience to evaluate the technical principles and operations involved in the work of the Department.

2. Transfers the following offices now in the Department of the Interior:

- Patent Office to the Department of Commerce;
- Bureau of Pensions to the Treasury Department;
- Bureau of Education to the Department of Labor;
- Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Department of Labor;
- St. Elizabeth and Freedmen's Hospitals to the Treasury Department;

The Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Howard University to the Bureau of Education in the Department of Labor.

3. Transfers to the Department of Public Works the following offices:

The Supervising Architect's Office from the Department of the Treasury;
 The Construction Division of the United States Army;
 The River and Harbor Improvements from the Department of War;
 The Mississippi River Commission from the Department of War;
 The California Debris Commission from the Department of War;
 The Coast and Geodetic Survey from the Department of Commerce;
 The Bureau of Standards from the Department of Commerce;
 The Bureau of Public Roads from the Department of Agriculture;
 The Forest Service from the Department of Agriculture.

4. Provides for the detail of Army officers now engaged in the foregoing activities to the Department of Public Works for two years, or until the Secretary of Public Works can transfer such activities to civil administration. The future details of members of the Corps of Engineers are to be for the purpose of acquiring instruction, training or experience.

5. Creates four assistant secretaryships, with salaries of \$7,500 each, to be held by experts who are to be removable only for cause on charges and who are to be included in any Civil Service Retirement Law. One is to have charge of engineering design and construction, one of architectural design and construction, one of scientific work and surveys, and one of land and legal matters.

The noteworthy feature of this bill as it affects education is the concentration in the Department of Labor of the major educational concerns of the Government. The Department of Labor would thus become in effect, if not in name, a Department of Labor and Education.

THE OWEN-McDUFFIE BILL FOR THE CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

S. 814 and H. R. 5724

1. Creates a Department of Public Health with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet and an Assistant Secretary.

2. Authorizes the President to transfer to the Department of Public Health all Bureaus or offices devoted to health matters, except the Medical Corps and other similar branches of the Army, Navy and Marine Corps.

3. The Department is to have the following Bureaus:

- a.* Bureau of Sanitary Research;
- b.* Bureau of Child Hygiene;
- c.* Bureau of Vital Statistics;

- d. Bureau of Food and Drugs.
- e. Bureau of Quarantine;
- f. Bureau of Sanitary Engineering;
- g. Bureau of Government Hospitals;
- h..Bureau of Personnel and Accounts.

4. The Secretary of Public Health is authorized to call into consultation the Health Officers of the several States who will constitute an advisory board.

5. Ten million dollars is appropriated for cooperation with the States in promotion of public health on condition that the States match the appropriation. The sum is to be divided as follows:

\$1,000,000 for establishing a homogeneous health administration;

\$2,000,000 for rural sanitation;

\$5,000,000 for control of communicable diseases;

\$2,000,000 for a scientific study of the causes and manner of transmission of disease.

The educational bearing of this measure is, of course, indirect. One section provides that "it shall be the specific duty of the Department of Public Health to foster and promote all matters pertaining to the conservation and improvement of public health and to collect and disseminate information relating thereto." The line of demarcation between the spheres of the health authorities and the educational authorities has always been hard to draw in the States and cities. If both this bill and the Smith-Towner bill pass, the question would be brought back to the central Government. Indeed the conjunction of these two measures in the legislative program of Congress raises anew the question as to whether a combination of the educational and health interests of the Government into a Department of Education and Public Health is not desirable.

BILLS CREATING NEW FEDERAL BOARDS OR COMMISSIONS

Students of government organization have often criticised the multiplicity of offices, boards and bureaus which are engaged in educational work. Indeed Congress has recently shown a tendency to create a new agency to administer each new educational project. The measures discussed under the preceding caption were essentially consolidation measures. The familiar tendency, however, is revealed in a considerable group of bills, the most important of which are summarized below.

THE SHEPPARD-TOWNER BILL FOR THE PROMOTION OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY

S. 3259. H. R. 10925

1. Appropriates \$480,000—\$10,000 for each State, together with an additional \$2,000,000 in 1921, increasing to \$4,000,000 by 1926, for the purpose of cooperating with the States in promoting the care of maternity and infancy.

2. States accepting the Act must match the appropriations dollar for dollar.

3. The administration of the fund is to be under the Federal Board of Maternal and Infant Hygiene, to be composed of the Secretary of Labor, the Chief of the Children's Bureau as the executive officer, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and the Commissioner of Education.

4. States accepting the Act must appoint State Boards of Maternal and Infant Hygiene, each to consist of not less than three members, to cooperate with the Federal Board. The Federal Board *may require the State Boards to appoint advisory committees*, half of whose members are to be women.

5. The Federal Board is authorized to use not to exceed 5 per cent of the total annual appropriation for administration and investigation.

6. State Boards must submit plans including provisions for instruction in the hygiene of maternity and infancy through public health nurses and consultation centers, and including also provision for medical and nursing care of mothers. For this purpose the extension facilities of State universities and State Colleges may be used; but not to exceed 25 per cent of the amounts granted by the United States can be spent for this part of the work.

Aside from the provision for a new Federal board several features of this bill are worthy of special attention: (1) Obviously such a program as is contemplated is closely related to the functions of the proposed Department of Public Health (see page 13). The two measures should be considered together. (2) The provision for the possible compulsory appointment of advisory committees represents a new and significant departure in Federal legislation. (3) In providing for the distribution of sums up to \$1,000,000 a year from the Federal funds among the extension divisions of State institutions, the bill crosses the orbit of Senate bill 1356 (see page 20). If there is a likelihood of the passage of both measures in the near future, each should be recast with reference to the provisions of the other. (4) The principle of dollar for dollar appropriations appears again.

THE GRONNA BILL FOR THE PROMOTION OF ENGINEERING AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

S. 105

1. A National Board of Engineering and Industrial Research, consisting of the Secretary of Commerce with the National Research Council, is established to promote engineering research, industrial progress and scientific investigation.

2. The National Board is to appoint State Boards, each to consist of five engineers or scientists. Nominations of members for each State Board are to be made by the Presidents of the publicly supported higher institutions in the States and of at least two private higher institutions, the governing board of at least one State technical society and the governing boards of at least four national technical societies.

3. The National Board must create within itself an Executive Committee of six, of which the Secretary of Commerce shall be chairman, to coordinate State projects.

4. State Boards are to supervise and control all engineering and industrial research undertaken under the provisions of this act and to compile data. State boards may use any university or research laboratory. They are instructed to publish annual reports and bulletins.

5. \$15,000 annually is appropriated for the expenses of the National Board and \$15,000 for each State Board.

It may be noted that this bill proposes a Federal subsidy for a part of the work which the National Research Council is now doing without subsidy. It substitutes for the scheme of administration which the National Research Council has developed a highly elaborate plan devised with reference to the main political divisions of the country, the States. The proposed National Board of Engineering and Industrial Research, including, as is proposed, the whole National Research Council, would have a membership of several hundred. The functioning of such a body in the manner suggested would apparently be incompatible with the present independent status of the National Research Council, operating as a non-governmental agency.

THE LENROOT-FESS WAR SERVICE EDUCATION BILL

S. 3006. H. R. 9322

1. The War Service Education bill creates a Federal Board for War Service Educational Facilities, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commissioner of Education and four veterans of the World War, to be appointed by the President, each of the latter at an annual salary of \$5,000. The Board is to appoint a Secretary at an annual salary of \$4,000.

2. A certain number of employees of the Board are exempt from Civil Service regulations, and in all cases preference is to be given to veterans seeking employment under the Board.

3. The Board is to maintain a main office in the District of Columbia with branch offices as it deems necessary.

4. Any veteran is to be entitled to receive \$60 a month for nine months, together with traveling expenses for the purpose of securing instruction at an approved institution.

5. The Board is to make a list of institutions appropriate for the educational work contemplated, and to prescribe the minimum number of courses or classes that a veteran shall be required to attend. The selection of the institution and of the courses of instruction is to be left as far as possible to the individual student.

6. A veteran's attendance at the institution of his choice must be satisfactory on penalty of forfeiting his allowance.

7. Such sums as may be necessary to make payments to veterans are to be appropriated, together with one million dollars annually for administrative expenses.

Whether the educational public is interested in measures designed to give special advantages to veterans or not, it will, of course, note three features of this bill. (1) The bill establishes a new board on the general model of the Federal Board for Vocational Education to administer this transient educational enterprise. (2) It establishes the principle of the preferential treatment of veterans in competition for Civil Service positions. (3) It makes the new Federal Board for War Service Educational Facilities potentially a standardizing agency with respect to educational institutions.

THE RAKER BILL FOR A NATIONAL SCHOOL OF CORRESPONDENCE

H. R. 1108

Creates a Board consisting of the President and the heads of the Executive Departments under whose direction the Commissioner of Education is to formulate a plan for the classification and distribution of Government publications and to cause instruction by correspondence of persons resident anywhere in the United States. The cost of the service is to be annually estimated by the Board and submitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury for the necessary appropriation.

The effect of this bill would be in substance to add the functions of a correspondence school to the Bureau of Education.

THE FLETCHER-DONOVAN BILL FOR A NATIONAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC AND ART

S. 561 and H. R. 1244

1. Establishes at the termination of the war for a period of not to exceed ten years a National Conservatory of Music and Art.

2. The Conservatory is to have five departments or branches, the headquarters to be located in Washington, the other branches to be in Florida, New York, Illinois and California.

3. The Conservatory is to be controlled by a Board of Regents, consisting of the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Chairman of the Committee on Education of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Education of the House.

4. The General Board of Regents is to select District Boards of Regents for all branch conservatories; each District Board shall consist of seven members, professional musicians or persons identified with music, selected on a non-partisan basis.

5. The General Board of Regents shall appoint a Director General. He may at the same time be designated by the President as Secretary of Music and of Fine Arts. He must be a graduate of a recognized musical college, university or conservatory. He shall appoint a committee of experts to make a curriculum for the conservatory.

6. The General Board of Regents is to decide the order of the establishment of the branches. It is to fix the standard of admission, the tuition fees and the number of free scholarships. It is to have power to grant certificates to music teachers who pass examinations set by the Director.

7. All employees, teachers and instructors must be citizens of the United States. Except the Director General, they are to be appointed in accordance with Federal Civil Service rules.

8. The Director General may by mutual agreement with State and municipal authorities supervise through the District directors the musical instruction in State or municipal schools, high schools, colleges and universities.

9. The Director General may arrange by agreement with the Labor Department to establish a Federal agency in connection with the National Conservatory.

This bill creates another *ex officio* board to administer a strictly educational undertaking. It carries the possibility of national standardization of instruction in music.

THE HUSTED JOINT RESOLUTION FOR A COMMISSION ON PUBLIC EDUCATION

H. J. Res. 46

1. Provides for a commission to inquire into the condition of public education in the several States. The Commission is to be known as the

Commission on Public Education. It is to consist of five persons appointed by the President with a compensation of \$25 per diem and expenses. It is to have power to hold hearings, administer oaths, compel testimony, etc.

2. It is to inquire into the condition of public education in the several States and recommend improvements. In particular it is instructed to report on the following matters:

a. The desirability of establishing a uniform system of public education under Federal regulation and control.

b. The advantages to be secured through Federal legislation of uniform application throughout the United States providing for compulsory education, registration of children, inspection of schools, examination and licensing of public school teachers and supervision of teaching.

c. The desirability of establishing a National system of military education and training.

d. The improvement of systems of public education in the several States with a view to securing better and more practical results.

e. The desirability of providing optional subjects in educational courses in colleges and universities and the extent, if any, to which such selection should be permitted.

f. Such constitutional amendment, legislation, or both as may be advisable and necessary to carry the commission's recommendations into effect.

3. The sum of \$150,000 is appropriated for the use of the commission.

The individual items of the program outlined for the Commission may or may not be endorsed by educational officers. Nevertheless it is clear that this measure represents an approach to the subject of Federal action on education that must especially commend itself to scientifically trained persons. It commits the country to nothing until a careful study has been made.

BILLS AFFECTING THE BUREAU OF EDUCATION

There is a considerable group of bills designed to add new tasks or new powers to the Bureau of Education, or to increase its resources. Three of these—the first three summarized below—have been advocated by the Bureau itself. The others have been introduced without the Bureau's sponsorship.

KENYON-VESTAL BILL FOR AMERICANIZATION

S. 3315 and H. R. 10710

1. Appropriates \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1920, and thereafter until June 30, 1923, \$12,500,000 annually for Americanization and for the education of illiterates and other persons not able to read or write English.

2. The sum is to be expended through the Bureau of Education under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior; \$500,000 of the sum annually may be used for investigation and administration.

3. To receive the benefits of the act each State must appropriate an equal amount. Each State must also require all citizens between the ages of 16 and 21 who are illiterate, or who cannot read or write English, and all alien residents between 16 and 45 who are illiterate or unable to speak, read, or write English, to attend classes for 200 hours for a year.

4. State plans and regulations must be approved by the Bureau of Education.

5. All Federal funds are to be used for the payment of teachers, or for the preparation of teachers.

This bill has just passed the Senate with amendments. The principal amendment reduces the appropriation from \$12,500,000 to \$6,500,000. It has not yet been reported by the House Committee on Education. It contains the principle of Federal participation in the educational affairs of the States which appears in the Smith-Towner bill. It embodies with minor modifications the features of that bill which relate to illiteracy and the education of non-English speaking foreigners.

THE SHEPPARD BILL FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

S. 2203

1. For the study and improvement of rural education \$275,000 a year is appropriated to the Bureau of Education until 1939.

2. Sums not to exceed \$200,000 a year may be used for conducting model rural schools in cooperation with State and local officers.

The intent of this measure is to strengthen the work now being done by the Rural School Division of the Bureau of Education, particularly by providing facilities for the demonstration method.

THE SHEPPARD BILL FOR EDUCATIONAL EXTENSION

S. 1536

1. Authorizes the Bureau of Education to direct a system of civic, social and health extension education in connection with the several State universities and other State institutions or, in the absence of a State university, in connection with the State Department of Education.

2. Defines extension education as comprehended in the Bill.

3. Appropriates \$480,000 a year, \$10,000 for each State, with additional sums increasing eventually to a total of four and one-half millions, on condition that the States accepting the Act appropriate equal sums.

4. Plans for the work must be submitted to and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

5. Nothing is appropriated for administration.

The purpose of this bill is to duplicate for general university extension the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act for agricultural extension. In the States where the Land Grant College is separated from the State University, the new enterprise created by this bill would be administered by the State University. In those States where the Land Grant College and the State University are one and the same institution, the funds provided by this bill would go to develop the general extension department of the institution. The function of the Bureau of Education in directing the work would be similar to that now exercised by the Department of Agriculture in connection with the Smith-Lever Act.

The remaining measures relating to the Bureau of Education may be very briefly summarized without comment.

THE MACLEAN-RAKER BILL PROVIDING FOR A LIBRARY INFORMATION SERVICE

S. 2457 and H. R. 6870

1. Creates a Division of Library Service in the Bureau of Education, with a chief at \$4,000, an Assistant Director at \$3,000, and others. \$8,100 may be spent for salaries and travel outside the District of Columbia. The total estimated annual expense is \$18,700.

2. The Division is charged with providing American Libraries with current information concerning government publications and activities.

THE WALSH BILL FOR THE PROMOTION OF EDUCATIONAL EXTENSION

S. 2121

1. Creates a Division of Educational Extension in the Bureau of Education to cooperate with university extension divisions of State universities, and other public educational agencies in the States in investigating and promoting educational extension.

2. Defines extension and excludes that extension provided for in the Smith-Lever Act. The Commissioner of Education may cooperate with the State extension agencies in any manner agreed upon by him and the States and may also cooperate with other departments or agencies of the Government.

3. No appropriation is carried in the Bill.

THE SPENCER-DYER BILL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A STATION FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN.

S. 2376 and H. R. 8479.

1. Establishes in the Bureau of Education a station for the investigation of mentally handicapped children, which is to have the following tasks:

- a.* The collection and dissemination of information concerning mental tests;
- b.* The conduct of a laboratory of mental tests and standards;
- c.* The conduct of a psycho-educational clinic;

2. Salary and administration expenses range between \$23,400 and \$30,000.

NOLAN BILL FOR A DIVISION OF CIVIC TRAINING

H. R. 3079

Creates a Division of Civic Training in the Bureau of Education, with a Chief at \$4,500, and provides for other employees as needed, to increase the efficiency of American citizenship.

BILLS AFFECTING THE FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

A large number of bills have been introduced which bear either on the vocational rehabilitation of men injured in industry or on the rehabilitation of disabled soldiers. At the present writing, the Federal Board for Vocational Education does not concern itself with the rehabilitation of industrial cripples. Of the numerous bills bearing on this matter that were introduced during the first session of the present Congress, but one now is regarded as having vitality. A bill passed the Senate and another passed the House. There is now before the Senate the following measure which has been reported by the Committee on Education. It is an amended form of the House Bill.

THE FESS BILL FOR THE NATIONAL REHABILITATION OF PERSONS INJURED IN INDUSTRY

H. R. 4438

1. Appropriates \$750,000 for the year 1921 and \$1,000,000 for three years thereafter for the purpose of cooperating with the States in the vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry and in returning them to civil employment. The fund is to be apportioned among the

States in the proportion which their population bears to the total population of the United States, but no State is to receive less than \$5,000.

2. The appropriation must be matched dollar for dollar by the States accepting the Act.

3. States must submit plans to the Federal Board for Vocational Education and carry on the work under the specific direction of the Federal Board.

4. Local control is to be vested in the State Board for Vocational Education.

5. There is to be added \$75,000 for a period of four years for the Federal Board for investigation and administration. The maximum salary (allowed to only one person) is \$5,000. Four others may receive \$4,000 and five others \$3,500. No other salary may exceed \$2,500.

It will be observed that this bill, like the Americanization Bill cited above, does not commit Congress to appropriations for this work beyond four years. The limitations on salaries is in line with the present tendency of Congress to keep educational salaries low. The bill carries a much smaller appropriation both for cooperation with the States and for administration than was originally proposed. The present measure may properly be regarded as providing stimulation for a new enterprise, rather than support.

The Federal Board's administration of the task of vocational rehabilitation of disabled soldiers has led to the introduction of the following bills, which are cited in the order of their presentation to the House:

ROGERS AMENDMENT OF THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

H. R. 10875

It provides for the vocational rehabilitation of any who have suffered a 10 per cent loss of earning capacity through disability incurred in military service or traceable to military service.

CRAMTON AMENDMENT OF THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

H. R. 10878

Amends the Vocational Rehabilitation Act by authorizing the Federal Board for Vocational Education to prescribe courses, pay travel and subsistence for persons undergoing rehabilitation, and place them when rehabilitated in suitable occupations. The facilities of the Department of Labor may be used by the Federal Board for this purpose.

THE GREENE AMENDMENT OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

H. R. 11442 and H. R. 11724

Provides for the addition of a representative of the Army and Navy of the United States who shall have had active service in the late war, but who is not now connected with the Army or Navy, to the membership of the Federal Board for Vocational Education at a salary of \$5,000.

THE STEVENSON BILL FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF DISABLED MEMBERS OF MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES TO CLERICAL POSITIONS.

H. R. 11444.

Provides for the appointment on certification by the Federal Board for Vocational Education of disabled former soldiers, sailors, marines or nurses to any vacancies hereafter occurring in the clerical or other positions in the executive branch of the Government.

ROGERS BILL FOR THE RELOCATION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

H. R. 11448

Provides for the transfer of the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States from the Federal Board for Vocational Education to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance of the Treasury Department.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

A large number of bills bearing upon education can hardly be brought under any scheme of classification. The most important of these are the following:

THE FESS BILL FOR A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

H. R. 9353

1. It establishes at Washington a National University for the promotion of scientific research, the preparing of people for public service, and cooperation with the Federal Government, with colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, State universities and other higher institutions.

2. Only holders of master's degrees or the equivalent shall be admitted. The university itself is to grant no degrees.

3. The University is to be controlled by a Board consisting of the Commissioner of Education and twelve persons appointed by the President, each for a term of twelve years.

4. The Board Trustees is to be assisted by an advisory council, consisting of one representative from each State. The President of the State University shall be the representative from each State in which there is a

State University. In other States the Governors shall appoint the representatives. The advisory council shall have power to veto any statute or general regulation proposed by the trustees. It shall have power to recommend on any matter concerning the university.

5. \$500,000 is appropriated for the uses of the University for the current year.

6. The various museums, libraries, bureaus, observatories and departments of research belonging to the Federal Government are to be open for the use of graduate students.

THE JACOWAY BILL FOR MARKETING DEPARTMENTS IN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES

H. R. 4124

1. Establishes marketing departments in colleges of agriculture to give instruction and practical demonstrations in marketing and the distribution of farm products.

2. Appropriates \$250,000 annually to be distributed to the States for the support of such departments on condition that the States appropriate equal amounts.

The appropriation is made to the college of each State which is now receiving the benefits of the Land Grant Act of 1862. In case there are now or hereafter two such institutions, the State Legislature is to designate the one to receive the fund. The administration of the Act is placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture and it is implied, if not specifically stated, that he is to appoint the instructors in marketing, subject to the approval of the institutional officers. No method of apportioning the \$250,000 is prescribed.

THE RAKER BILL FOR A BUREAU FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB

H. R. 1109

1. Creates a Deaf and Dumb Bureau in the Department of Labor in charge of a person who knows the sign language and manual alphabet.

2. The Bureau is to study industrial, social and educational conditions of the deaf and dumb in the United States.

3. A Chief at \$3,000 is provided for. All subordinates, as far as practicable, are to be deaf and dumb persons.

THE McKELLAR BILL FOR THE EDUCATION AND NATURALI- ZATION OF ALIENS

S. 3296

1. Provides that no alien may reside in the United States more than five years without becoming naturalized and reduces the residence for naturalization to three years.

2. No alien is to be admitted to citizenship unless he can speak English. The judge must examine each alien with respect to his understanding of English, and as to whether or not he holds radical views or is connected with radical organizations.

3. All employers of as many as thirty aliens must provide 200 hours of instruction in English for one year; or if the State or community provides such instruction, the employer must include the instruction in the working time of alien employees and pay them.

4. All aliens and children of aliens are to be taught in English-speaking schools.

THE LEVER RURAL HEALTH BILL

H. R. 2845

1. Provides for the cooperation of the Public Health Service with State Boards of Health in the prevention, control and mitigation of the diseases of people in rural districts.

2. Annual appropriations beginning with the sum of \$250,000 and increasing to \$1,000,000 after 1921 are provided, to be distributed among the States.

3. The Secretary of the Treasury may deduct not to exceed \$50,000 a year for administration.

4. In order to receive the benefits of the Act, the States must submit plans for approval by the Secretary of the Treasury and must match the Federal appropriation dollar for dollar.

5. A Division of Public Hygiene is to be established in the Public Health Service under an Assistant Surgeon General, who is to have charge of the work.

Educational officers are especially interested in this measure because of its bearing on university extension. Instruction in public health in rural districts is now one of the tasks of many university extension departments.

THE SMITH BILL FOR ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATIONS

S. 16

1. Establishes an engineering experiment station in each State and Territory in connection with *some* university, engineering school or land grant college to perform experiments and conduct investigations relating to engineering, and to publish reports and bulletins.

2. There is appropriated to each State \$30,000 for the first year, \$40,000 for the second year and \$50,000 annually thereafter for each station.

3. The State Legislature is authorized to designate the institution best equipped for the work as the recipient of the appropriation, but the Land Grant college of the State shall be designated if its facilities are approximately equal to those of other institutions.

4. The Secretary of Commerce is to coordinate the work, and to sug-

gest lines of investigation, but the responsibility for the initiation and conduct of research rests with the individual station. \$50,000 are appropriated annually for the administration of experiment stations through the Department of Commerce.

5. Each station is to be a depository of the Bureau of Standards and to conform to the standards established by the U. S. Government.

This is the familiar engineering experiment station measure in a somewhat altered form. The bill seeks to steer a middle course between the claims of the separated Land Grant college and the separated State University by providing that the State Legislature is to designate as the beneficiary the institution that is best organized and equipped to conduct the experimental work. A slight preferential treatment is still accorded the Land Grant college through the provision that it is to be designated as the location of the experiment station if its facilities are approximately equal to those of other institutions.

The preceding pages have set forth the principal educational ideas of Congress as these have been embodied in the form of bills introduced since the war. The office of the American Council on Education has in its possession thirty to forty other bills with educational features. Nearly all of these, however, are either of local application or in the nature of routine. No large questions of national policy are involved. In succeeding issues of the Record, it is proposed to include a critical discussion of certain of the measures which are briefly summarized in this article.

American Council on Education

THE American Council on Education is the central organization in which the great national educational associations are represented. Its general object is to promote and carry out cooperative action in matters of common interest to the associations and to the institutions composing them. It has three classes of members, constituent, associate and institutional. The constituent members are sixteen national educational associations. Each is represented by three delegates who vote as a unit at meetings of the Council through a designated person. Associate members are educational or scientific organizations having interests related to the work of the Council. Associate members may send one representative each to the meetings of the Council without right to vote. Institutional members are colleges, universities, professional and technical schools, contributing not less than \$100 a year to the treasury of the Council. Each may be represented by one delegate at meetings of the Council without right to vote. The present membership of the Council in all three classes is listed below.

The officers of the Council are elected annually. Its headquarters are in Washington at 818 Connecticut Avenue. They are in charge of a Director with assistants. The officers of the Council for 1919-20 are:

Chairman, President Harry Pratt Judson, University of Chicago, representing the Association of American Universities.

First Vice-Chairman, Dean Eugene Davenport, University of Illinois, representing the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations.

Second Vice-Chairman, President John H. MacCracken, Lafayette College, representing the Association of American Colleges.

Secretary, Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Barnard College, representing the Association of Collegiate Alumnae.

Treasurer, Mr. Corcoran Thom, Vice-President of the American Security and Trust Company, Washington, D. C.

Director, Samuel P. Capen.

Executive Committee:

The Chairman.

The Secretary.

The Director.

President D. J. Cowling, Carleton College, representing the Association of American Colleges.

President A. Ross Hill, University of Missouri, representing the National Association of State Universities.

President D. B. Johnson, Winthrop Normal and Industrial College, representing the National Council of Normal School Presidents and Principals.

Dr. C. R. Mann, General Staff of the War Department, representing the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education.

Bishop T. J. Shahan, Catholic University of America, representing the Catholic Educational Association.

Professor H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, representing the American Association of University Professors.

Each of the Council's major projects is in charge of a standing committee. The following are the undertakings in which progress has already been made or which have been authorized by the Executive Committee.

1. *Federal Legislation*.—It is of the first importance that the educational interests of the country should be instructed as to the existence and purport of proposed Federal legislation affecting education. The Council's office has digested the seventy-odd educational bills now before Congress. A classified summary of the more important of them appears in this issue of the Educational Record. It will be followed in later issues by critical analyses and discussion of the principles involved in the more far-reaching legislative measures. This undertaking is in charge of a standing Committee on Federal Legislation.

2. *International Educational Relations*.—During the past eighteen months, some eight or nine different agencies have entered the field of international education, to the confusion both of foreign educational officers and of the educational interests of the United States. The Council has succeeded in bringing about a working agreement between a number of these bodies so that duplication may be avoided and the situation made clear to foreigners. It hopes to effect a still greater consolidation of

these activities in the near future. Probably, in view of the large number of bodies now operating in this field, the Council will not itself take a very prominent part in the promotion of international exchanges of professors and students. It has agreed, however, to be responsible for an effort to bring about a uniform treatment by American universities of foreign degree holders. It has also agreed to interpret to foreign educational officials existing lists of approved institutions. It will of course participate in the entertainment of any official foreign delegation of scholars. These matters are in charge of a standing Committee on International Educational Relations.

3. *Education for Citizenship.*—The Council has a standing Committee on Education for Citizenship, including Military Training. The committee proposes to study and report on Education for citizenship in higher institutions and teacher training agencies with particular reference to questions of military training. It expects also to review the work of various committees on education for citizenship which have been appointed by other educational associations and to make a final report which will combine the basic principles and recommendations upon which all agree.

4. *Training of Women for Public Service.*—A standing Committee on the Training of Women for Public Service is the successor of a committee which functioned effectively during the war. Its plans are not yet completed. Its purpose is, however, to study the possible openings for highly-trained women in the public service, the qualifications required and the kind of academic training best adapted to meet the various needs.

5. *The College of Liberal Arts.*—The executive committee has authorized the appointment of a standing Committee on the Status and Problems of the College of Arts and Sciences. The committee has not yet been appointed but it is assumed that it will make a comprehensive study of the present relations of the college of arts and sciences to the university and professional schools, to the vocational schools on the same academic level, such as schools of commerce, journalism and engineering, to the junior college, etc. It will also undoubtedly consider the fundamental aims of colleges of liberal arts with a view to formulating a definition of this type of institution appropriate to the present time.

6. *Standardization.*—The Council also proposes to bring about

a greater uniformity of procedure among the principal agencies now engaged in defining college standards. To this end the executive committee of the Council has authorized the appointment of a committee which shall be composed of representatives of the principal standardizing bodies.

The Council also has a standing Committee on Cooperating Societies and a Finance Committee.

STANDING COMMITTEES WITH THEIR CHAIRMEN

Federal Legislation:

President John H. MacCracken, Lafayette College.

International Educational Relations.

Dean Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania.

Education for Citizenship, including Military Trainings

President M. L. Burton, University of Minnesota.

Training of Women for Public Service:

Mrs. Gertrude S. Martin, Cornell University.

Status and Problems of Colleges of Arts and Sciences:

(Chairman to be appointed.)

Information and Standards:

(Chairman to be appointed.)

Cooperating Societies:

Professor H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Finance:

President D. J. Cowling, Carleton College.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

CONSTITUENT MEMBERS

1. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES:

President Arthur T. Hadley, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

President Harry Pratt Judson, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Dean Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

2. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES:

President A. Ross Hill, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

- President P. L. Campbell, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
- President M. L. Burton, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
3. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES:
- President Wm. W. Guth, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
- President John H. MacCracken, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
- President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
4. ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES:
- President L. H. Murlin, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
- Professor Frederick B. Robinson, College of the City of New York, New York City.
- President, P. R. Kolbe, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.
4. CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION:
- Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
- Professor Edward A. Pace, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
- Professor J. A. Burns, Holy Cross College, Washington, D. C.
6. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES AND EXPERIMENT STATIONS:
- President C. A. Lory, Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo.
- President R. A. Pearson, Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Ames, Iowa.
- Dean Eugene Davenport, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
7. SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION:
- Dean F. L. Bishop, University of Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Dr. Charles R. Mann, War Department, Washington, D. C.
- President Fred W. McNair, Michigan College of Mines, Houghton, Mich.

8. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS:
(Not yet officially appointed)
9. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES:
Dean Burton D Myers, Indiana School of Medicine,
Bloomington, Ind.
Dr. William Welsh, John Hopkins University, Balti-
more, Md.
Dr. Walter Cannon, Harvard University, Cambridge,
Mass.
10. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL:
Dr. John C. Merriam, University of California, Ber-
keley, Cal.
Professor Armin O. Leuschner, University of Cali-
fornia, Berkeley, Cal.
Professor Robert M. Yerkes, University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minn.
11. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS:
Professor H. W. Tyler, Mass. Inst. of Technology,
Cambridge, Mass.
Professor John M. Coulter, University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.
Professor M. R. Cohen, College of the City of New
York, New York City.
12. ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE ALUMNAE:
Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Barnard College,
Columbia University, New York City.
Mrs. Gertrude S. Martin, Cornell University, Ithaca,
N. Y.
Mrs. G. L. Swiggett, Washington, D. C.
13. NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION:
Dean Lotus D. Coffman, University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minn.
Professor George D. Strayer, Teachers College, Co-
lumbia University, New York City.
Secretary J. W. Crabtree, 1400 Massachusetts Ave.,
Washington, D. C.
14. N. E. A.—DEPARTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENCE:
Dr. Thomas Finnegan, State Superintendent of Public
Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa.

Supt. Ellis W. Graff, Dept. of Public Instruction, Indianapolis, Ind.

Dr. James C. Joyner, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Raleigh, N. C.

15. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NORMAL SCHOOL PRESIDENTS AND PRINCIPALS:

President Homer H. Seerley, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.

Dr. D. B. Johnson, Winthrop Normal and Industrial College, Rockhill, S. C.

Mr. Charles S. Chapin, New Jersey State Normal School, Montclair, N. J.

16. COUNCIL ON MEDICAL EDUCATION OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION:

Dr. A. D. Bevan, University of Chicago.

Dr. William Pepper, University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. N. P. Colwell, Secretary of the Council on Medical Education.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

1. ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RHODES SCHOLARS:

Professor Frank Aydelotte, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

2. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE:

Dr. L. O. Howard, Smithsonian Institution.

3. AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION:

Dr. Waldo G. Leland, Carnegie Institution.

4. AMERICAN SCANDINAVIAN FOUNDATION:

Professor W. H. Schofield, Harvard University.

5. ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE:

Professor W. P. Laird, University of Pennsylvania.

6. COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION:

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Chicago, Ill.

7. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DIRECTORS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH:

Professor B. R. Buckingham, University of Illinois.

8. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION:

Dr. H. F. Cope, Chicago, Ill.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

ALABAMA:

Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

CALIFORNIA:

Leland Stanford, Jr., University.

Mills College.

Pomona College.

Throop College of Technology.

University of California.

University of Southern California.

COLORADO:

Colorado College.

Colorado State Teachers College.

University of Colorado.

CONNECTICUT:

Connecticut College.

Wesleyan University.

Yale University.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

Catholic University of America.

GEORGIA:

Brenau College.

ILLINOIS:

De Paul University.

Eureka College.

James Millikin University.

Knox College.

Rockford College.

University of Chicago.

University of Illinois.

Wheaton College.

Y. M. C. A. College of Chicago.

INDIANA:

Butler College.

DePauw University.

Rose Polytechnic Institute.

University of Notre Dame.

IOWA:

Cornell College.

Grinnell College.

Iowa State Teachers College.

Luther College.

Upper Iowa University.

KANSAS:

Baker University.

KENTUCKY:

Center College.

Georgetown College.

University of Kentucky.

MAINE:

Bowdoin College.

MARYLAND:

Goucher College.

Johns Hopkins University.

Maryland College for Women.

Maryland State College.

MASSACHUSETTS:

Boston University.

Harvard University.

Mount Holyoke College.

Radcliffe College.

Smith College.

Tufts College.

Wellesley College.

MICHIGAN:

Albion College.

Alma College.

Kalamazoo College.

MINNESOTA:

Carleton College.

- College of St. Catherine.
 College of St. Olaf.
 College of St. Teresa.
 College of St. Thomas.
 Hamline University.
 Macalester College.
 University of Minnesota.
- MISSOURI:
- Southeast Missouri State
 Teachers College.
- NEW HAMPSHIRE:
- Dartmouth College.
- NEW JERSEY:
- College of St. Elizabeth.
- NEW YORK:
- Alfred University.
 Colgate University.
 Columbia University.
 Hamilton College.
 New York University.
 University of Rochester.
 Wells College.
- NORTH CAROLINA:
- Elon College.
 St. Genevieve's College.
 University of North Carolina.
- OHIO:
- Case School of Applied
 Science.
 Defiance College.
 Denison University.
 Lake Erie College.
 Marietta College.
 Miami University.
 Municipal University of
 Akron.
 Muskingum College.
 Oberlin College.
 Ohio State University.
- Ohio Wesleyan University.
 Otterbein University.
 Western College for Women.
 Western Reserve University.
- OREGON:
- University of Oregon.
- PENNSYLVANIA:
- Allegheny College.
 Bryn Mawr College.
 Drexel Institute.
 Dropsie College.
 Grove City College.
 Haverford College.
 Lafayette College.
 Lehigh University.
 Temple University.
 University of Pennsylvania.
 University of Pittsburgh.
- SOUTH CAROLINA:
- Winthrop Normal and Industrial College.
- SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Huron College.
 University of South Dakota.
- TEXAS:
- University of Texas.
- VERMONT:
- University of Vermont.
- VIRGINIA:
- Sweet Briar College.
 University of Virginia.
- WISCONSIN:
- Beloit College.
 Campion College.
 Lawrence College.
 Marquette University.
 Milwaukee Downer College.
 Ripon College.
 St. Clara College.

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly by

The American Council on Education

Volume 1

April, 1920

No. 2

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

Pending Federal Legislation

By the Editor

Educational and Universal Training

By Charles R. Mann

Some New Professional Standards for College Women

By Elizabeth Kemper Adams

University Problems

By Arthur O. Lovejoy

Accredited Higher Institutions

By the Editor

The American Council on Education

By the Editor

Annual Subscription, \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1920
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Pending Federal Legislation

A DIGEST of the principal educational bills then before Congress was presented in the January issue of *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD*. Since that issue went to press, twenty-four more bills and joint resolutions affecting education have been introduced. Those that have wide national significance are summarized in this article in order to complete the record of pending Federal legislation.

It is interesting to note which aspects of the educational situation have drawn the attention of Congress in spite of its absorption during the past three months in the coming political campaign, the peace treaty and labor questions. The two great educational issues now before states and local communities—the salary question and the shortage of teachers—are not reflected in recently proposed Congressional legislation nor do these issues appear to have influenced any of the measures previously summarized by the American Council on Education, except the Smith-Towner bill (see *EDUCATIONAL RECORD*, Vol. 1, No. 1, page 12 and following). Instead, Congress seems concerned with questions of Americanization, health education, military preparation, and the care of veterans of the great war. The recent difficulties of the Federal Board for Vocational Education in administering the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers has also made that board the target for a broadside of bills and resolutions. But otherwise the measures introduced in the last three months have been so miscellaneous that classification of them is almost impossible. The order in which they are presented in the following summary is arbitrary.

THE CAPPER-FESS BILL FOR THE PROMOTION OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

S. 3950 and H. R. 12652

1. Defines the purpose of physical education in the meaning of this Act as "more fully and thoroughly to prepare the boys and girls of the nation for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship through the development of bodily vigor and endurance, muscular strength and skill, bodily and mental poise, and such desirable moral and social qualities as courage,

self-control, self-subordination, cooperation under leadership, and disciplined initiative. The facilities for securing these ends shall be understood to include a comprehensive course of physical training activities; periodical physical examination; correction of postural and other remedial defects; health supervision of schools and school children; practical instruction in the care of the body and in the principles of health; hygienic school life; sanitary school buildings, playgrounds, and athletic fields, and the equipment thereof, etc."

2. Appropriates \$10,000,000 for 1921, and for each subsequent year an amount sufficient to allot one dollar per child of school age in each state which accepts the act, for the preparation through state institutions of teachers and supervisors of physical education, including medical examiners and school nurses.

3. Allots the appropriation in the proportion which the population of each state between the ages of 6 and 18 years bears to the total population of the United States between the same ages.

4. Establishes a division in the Bureau of Education to administer the act and conduct investigations. The Commissioner of Education is required to cooperate with the Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau and other governmental agencies. The Commissioner through the Division of Physical Education is to publish uniform rules and regulations to aid the states in carrying out the act.

5. Appropriates to the Bureau of Education \$300,000 a year for administration and investigation.

6. Establishes in the Bureau of Public Health Service a division of Child Hygiene to be under an Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. This division is to cooperate with state boards of health in research and demonstrations relating to child hygiene, and with the Commissioner of Education in making regulations.

7. Appropriates \$200,000 to the U. S. Public Health Service for investigation and administration.

8. States accepting the act must designate the chief state educational officer, or other authorized agency, to administer the act and must appropriate a sum of money equal to their respective allotments from the Federal Government. No part of the Federal funds can be used for the payment of supervisors and teachers of physical education until the state has established a satisfactory system for the preparation of such officers. Within five years after the acceptance of the act, each state must make provision for the physical education of all children between 6 and 18.

9. The Commissioner of Education is to approve all plans of state officers and apportion funds to the state when plans are approved. The bill specifies that plans must include ample provision by state and local authorities for physical education and the equipment therefor. The Commissioner may withhold the apportionment any year from a state not spending its apportionment in accordance with the provisions of the act. The Commissioner is also to prescribe ways in which state accounts shall be kept and to audit these accounts.

This bill follows the familiar track beaten by the Smith-Hughes Act and the Kenyon bill (see EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Vol. 1, No. 1, page 21). It contains the provision for dollar for dollar appropriations, with final Federal approval of the projects for which the combined Federal and state appropriations are spent. It places in the hands of the Bureau of Education what may amount to absolute control of the whole physical educational effort of the states. No such far-reaching measure affecting education has yet been introduced except the Smith-Towner bill (see EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Vol. 1, No. 1, page 12). In the latter, however, it is explicitly provided that uniformity of plans is not required and that local educational authorities are to have full administrative charge. There is some difference of opinion as to whether under the Smith-Towner bill Federal authorities do not, in spite of this provision, still have the power to control education in the states. But in the Capper-Fess bill the matter is not open to doubt.

THE HOUSE BILL TO FOSTER THE MANUFACTURE OF
LABORATORY GLASSWARE, OPTICAL GLASS AND
SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS

H. R. 7785

Provides for the imposition of duties on laboratory glassware, optical glass, scientific and laboratory apparatus, surgical instruments, etc., and repeals the passage of the Tariff Act of 1913, under which schools and colleges could secure such articles duty free.

This bill has passed the House and has been recommended by the Committee on Finance of the Senate. It is on the Senate Calendar. The argument in favor of the repeal of the exemptions formerly enjoyed by schools and colleges is that unless duty free privileges are revoked the industries cannot live. The development of the industries was made as a war necessity. The proponents of the measure assert that it is essential that they be preserved against future emergencies. Germany and Japan can produce the articles in question more cheaply and can drive the American producers out of business unless protection is afforded. Educators and scientists testifying before the House and Senate Committees favored the abolition of duty free privileges.

THE FORDNEY NATIONAL SOLDIERS' LAND SETTLEMENT,
HOME AID, VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND ADJUSTED
COMPENSATION ACT

H. R. 13293

1. Establishes a national soldiers' settlement fund, to be administered by a board of five members under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior, not less than three members of the board to be discharged soldiers. \$500,000,000 is appropriated to maintain the fund for ten years. \$1,000,000 is appropriated in addition for administration.

2. The fund is designed to provide employment and rural homes for soldiers of the great war. The board may acquire lands by gift or purchase and may utilize public lands for soldier settlement projects. The bill specifies in detail how soldiers may purchase the land on long time payments, cash credit being given for each day of military service. It also specifies how loans may be made to soldiers to enable them to develop the lands.

3. \$50,000,000 is appropriated to pay a sum equal to \$2.00 a day for every day of military service to any soldier who selects this form of aid, to enable him to buy a home.

4. Any soldier who desires vocational training may be furnished such training by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for a period not exceeding in length the term of his military service. He will receive \$1.50 a day while undergoing the training. \$5,000,000 is appropriated to pay for the training and compensation of the soldiers taking it.

5. Any soldier not selecting any one of the foregoing options is entitled to receive \$1.50 per day for each day of his military service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, such sum to be payable as soon as funds therefor are available and not later than one year after the approval of the act.

All of the major proposals for the relief of veterans of the great war are combined in this measure. The basis of it is the plan for the settlement of soldiers on public lands proposed by former Secretary of the Interior Lane. The bill also embodies the proposal, urged intermittently ever since the summer of 1918, for the free vocational training of all veterans who desire such training. Finally, the bill includes a straight bonus provision for those soldiers who choose to receive their benefits in this form.

THE OWEN BILL FOR AN AMERICAN SCHOOL ARMY AND
AN AMERICAN RESERVE ARMY

S. 4070

1. Provides that the President shall annually call for the enlistment of 21,850 volunteers to serve in the American School Army for a period of three years and as reservists for a further period of twenty years.

Volunteers are to be between the ages of fifteen and eighteen years physically, mentally and morally fit, no educational tests being required. The right to enlist as volunteers is to be apportioned in equal numbers to each congressional district

2. A board of examiners composed of one regular army officer, two physicians and two citizens interested in education is to be appointed for each congressional district. No member of a board shall be a resident of the district for which he is appointed. .

3. The Secretary of War is instructed to provide proper school camps for the American School Army, using army posts and reservations and adding thereto by lease or purchase if necessary. He is also to furnish equipment, clothing and subsistence.

4. Cadets are to devote three hours per day to military training, physical education, sanitation and prevention of disease and are to live under military discipline.

5. A Vocational Board consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of Education is created to have charge of the education, vocational training and vocational labor of the cadets. The board may employ civilian teachers. It is to provide curricula designed to render each cadet at graduation industrially self-sustaining. The school year is to be nine months long.

6. The vocational earnings of cadets are to be pooled in a common fund from which each cadet is to receive not to exceed \$1.00 per week for incidental expenses.

7. Any cadet upon reaching vocational proficiency and after one year of service may be transferred to the Navy.

8. The American School Army is to engage in general military maneuvers for three months each year.

9. After graduation every cadet is to be a reservist for twenty years, subject to bear arms in the service of the United States.

10. The Secretary of War is instructed to select at the time of their graduation highly qualified cadets to enter the United States Military Academy or other military or technical institution according to the needs of the service.

11. The necessary appropriations are to be made on estimates of the Secretary of War.

In the January issue of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD the Wadsworth Bill, the McKellar-Howard Bill, and the Sears Bill were discussed. All provide for a combination of military training and general or vocational education. The Owen Bill presents another variant of the same propositions. Viewed as a measure for military preparedness it is much more modest than any one of the other three bills. It adds to the reserve army 21,850 men a year, as against the approximately 40,000 of the Sears Bill and the

750,000 of the Wadsworth Bill. The bill carries no specified appropriations, but it is safe to assume that this enterprise would be cheaper than those contemplated in the other measures mentioned.

Educators will probably note the fact that the volunteers of the American School Army will be several years younger on the average than the group of enlisted men or cadets designated in any of the other three bills. They will be schoolboys. The bill recognizes other agencies than the War Department in its provision for vocational and general education. It creates, however, another ex-officio Federal Board to have charge of these activities.

THE JOHNSON BILL FOR THE AMERICANIZATION OF ALIENS

H. R. 12269

1. Appropriates \$300,000 for the fiscal year 1920-21 to the Division of Citizenship Training of the Bureau of Naturalization to enable it to promote instruction in citizenship for persons of sixteen years of age and upward, using the aid of civic, educational, community, racial, and other organizations.

2. The Director of Citizenship is authorized to disseminate information regarding the institutions of the United States Government in such manner as will best stimulate loyalty to those institutions, making use of motion pictures, slides and other appropriate means.

It will be evident that if this bill and the Kenyon bill should both pass, two government offices would be charged with different phases of the work of Americanization.

THE ROGERS BILL FOR THE RELOCATION OF THE CARE OF DISABLED SOLDIERS

H. R. 13407

1. Transfers the functions performed by the U. S. Public Health Service in providing hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick or disabled soldiers, sailors and marines to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

2. Transfers likewise to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance the functions exercised by the Federal Board for Vocational Education in providing for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled soldiers, sailors and marines.

The current criticism of the Federal Board's conduct of vocational rehabilitation has also led to the introduction of resolutions authorizing an investigation of the board by the Committee on Education of the House and calling upon the board to report to

the House the facts concerning the alleged issuance of certain drastic instructions to its employes engaged in disposing of the applications of disabled soldiers for training.

THE KEYES-GILLETT BILL FOR THE WORLD-WIDE
EXTENSION OF EDUCATION BY THE COOPERA-
TION OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS

S. 4140 and H. R. 12994

1. Creates a commission to extend, in cooperation with other nations, education to all mankind.

2. Provides that the initial program shall be: the removal of illiteracy from all mankind, instruction in the applications of science and mechanics to the work of the world and the physical welfare of mankind or world health, international or world ethics promotive of just and humane government the world over.

3. The commission is to consist of the U. S. Commissioner of Education, and four other persons appointed by the President to confer with the authorities of all other nations and to secure their cooperation. The commission is instructed to induce the League of Nations to make world education a feature in world policy.

4. Appropriates \$10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the act.

In connection with this bill it may be interesting to recall that the Y. M. C. A. Overseas Educational Commission at the termination of its European service issued a memorandum advocating the establishment of a Bureau of Education under the League of Nations for the study of the international aspects of education and the promotion of education throughout the world. The establishment of such a bureau was also advocated by the U. S. Commissioner of Education at the 1919 meeting of the National Education Association.

THE MOORE JOINT RESOLUTION FOR THE CONSTITUTION
OF A SELECT JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION,
ACTIVITIES, AND METHODS OF BUSINESS OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

House Joint Resolution 298

I. Provides for the appointment of a select joint committee of five Representatives and five Senators empowered:

1. To study the general purpose or function of each distinct administrative service of the government; its specific activities; its organization and scope; its methods of business, etc.

2. To determine what, if any, changes should be made to enable each service better to discharge the function for which it has been created.

3. To determine what redistribution of activities should be made among the services with a view to having their activities performed by those services to which they more properly and logically belong and to the elimination of overlapping of jurisdiction and duplications of organizations, plans and work where found to exist.

4. To determine what regrouping of services departmentally and what new executive departments or bureaus of existing departments, if any, should be provided for. To consider especially the advisability of (a) removing from the War and Navy Departments all services and the performance of all activities which are not of a direct military or naval character; (b) the removal from the Treasury Department of all services and activities not pertaining directly to the administration of the financial affairs of the country; (c) the creation of a Department or Bureau of Public Works to take over all services having for their primary purpose the construction and operation of works of an engineering and construction character and to act as a contracting agency for the performance of such work for other services where called upon by such services so to do; (d) the creation of a Department or Bureau of Education and Science to take over the services now scattered among the several executive departments or existing as independent establishments, which have as their function, not the administration of any body of substantive law, but the prosecution of inquiry and the performance of other work having for their purpose the promotion of education and scientific research; (e) the creation of a Department or Bureau of Public Health that shall take over all activities relative to the protection and promotion of the public health, including such services as those for the enforcement of the pure-food laws, and meat inspections; and (f) the creation of a Department or Bureau of Maritime Affairs that shall take over such services as the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department, the Lake Survey of the War Department, the Coast Guard, The Bureau of Lighthouses, the Bureau of Navigation, the Bureau of Steamboat Inspection, and certain of the activities of the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation.

5. To study with a view to assembling into a consistent and logically arranged administrative code the laws relating to the organization, powers and methods of business of the several departments, bureaus, independent establishments and other services.

6. To study the laws relating to the submission of reports and estimates of appropriations with a view to simplifying and unifying them.

7. To study the existing system of appropriation heads with a view to making the system more consistent, etc.

II. The committee is authorized to employ experts and other employees. Its expenditures are to be paid from the contingent funds of the House and Senate.

This resolution is a far-reaching and constructive measure. Such an investigation as it prescribes has long been advocated

by students of government organization. There have been several forerunners, notably in recent years the investigation of the Taft Commission on Economy and Efficiency and the investigation of the Congressional Joint Commission on the Reclassification of Salaries.

The educational public will be particularly interested in the project for the study of those governmental services engaged in the prosecution of inquiries and the promotion of educational and scientific research, with a view to their consolidation into a single Department of Education and Science. This suggestion contemplates a more comprehensive consolidation of the government's educational interests than is contained in any other measure. It also represents a new conception of a Department of Education. Another feature of the measure which must especially commend it to scientifically trained persons is that it commits the government to no new organization of its educational affairs until a careful study has been made.

Education and Universal Training

THERE are some eighty bills now pending before Congress bearing upon some phase of education. Three now appear to be receiving favorable consideration. These all aim to introduce Federal organization of education to secure better citizens.

The following remarks and questions are presented concerning the probability of getting practical results by the means proposed in these three bills.

1. The Kenyon Bill (S. 3315) to promote Americanization by providing for cooperation with the several states in the education of non-English speaking persons and the assimilation of foreign born residents.

This bill proposes to wipe out illiteracy by requiring under penalty that all illiterates attend classes of instruction for not less than 200 hours per year until cured. The authority for this requirement is state legislation.

At present illiteracy among native born Americans results from laxity of compulsory school attendance laws. While every state has enacted compulsory attendance laws, the compulsory feature is in many cases merely nominal. For example, in five states compulsory attendance is subject to local or county option. In most states there are exemptions, such as: For those who have completed the fourth grade; for those upon whom needy members of the family are dependent for support; for those whose parents or guardians are unable to provide the necessary books and clothing; for those whose services are needed for farm emergencies; for those who reside more than three miles from school.

This being the situation with regard to compulsory school laws, is it probable that in a reasonable time the several states will enact the legislation requiring illiterates to attend school? If such legislation is enacted, is it likely to be enforced? If not this new legislation will not achieve the end sought by the Kenyon Bill.

Again, the Kenyon Bill requires that each state submit annually a report showing the plan for administration and supervision, the courses of study, the methods and kind of instruction, the equipment, the qualifications of teachers, the plans for the preparation of teachers, and the receipts and expenditures of money. No report is called for on the number of illiterates in the state or on the number that have been trained under this act. Does not this list of the items in the required report describe what would probably take place, namely a lengthy discussion of the project with elaborate plans and specifications of the qualifications of teachers with but a little actual production of results?

Again, this bill calls for not only a new set of laws in each state, but also for a new organization to enforce them. These new laws and organizations must be grafted on to the old, because of the inefficiency of which the present legislation is enacted. It is an effort to repair a system that has failed. While it is not impossible to succeed in this, the inevitable question is whether this is the practical, economic and efficient method of achieving the result.

2. The Smith-Towner Bill (S. 1017, H. R. 7) to create a department of education and to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the states in the promotion and support of education.

This bill calls for an appropriation of one hundred million dollars to be distributed among the states provided they appropriate a like amount. The entire two hundred million dollars is to be expended under regulations approved by a new department of education, which has still to be created. Specified portions of this sum must be spent in curing illiteracy, in encouraging physical education, developing vocational training and other specified purposes. The total expenditure for education in the United States is approximately a billion dollars per year and this bill therefore proposes to increase that expenditure by 20 per cent. Ten per cent of this comes from the states through the Federal government and the other 10 per cent is expended by the states. Because of drawing 10 per cent through the Federal government, the states agree to follow plans approved by the Federal Department of Education.

Is not this arrangement likely to prove a serious menace to the

fundamentally sound principle of local control of education? Examples are not wanting of the disastrous results that may follow the practical administration of this system.

This bill also calls for the creation of a new organization without experience. Presumably such an organization would accept conditions as they are and place its energies at work repairing the machine which has hitherto failed to deliver the goods.

3. The Wadsworth Bill (S. 3688) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the United States Army.

This bill contains provision for the establishment of a system of universal training,¹ which would require every young man to spend four months in camp under military training. The provision is also made for including general education and vocational training and for rating, testing, and classifying the young men in accordance with their abilities and aptitudes. The fundamental purpose of the bill is national defense.

This bill does not interfere in any way with local control of education. Its enforcement is not dependent upon state laws. The administration of universal training is entrusted to the War Department, which has just demonstrated its ability to handle efficiently this enterprise. Since all young men are subject to draft for this four months' period of training, all native born illiterates will be reached. The Army has demonstrated its ability to cure illiteracy in three months. It has demonstrated its ability to increase physical strength and coordination.

It is suggested that little training can be given in four months. This period is not to be regarded, however, as mainly for training purposes. It is essentially a period of tryout to check up the attainments of the young men and classify them for possible service in an emergency.

The operation of this law practically sets a national standard of manhood and provides the means of finding out how far that standard has been achieved. It serves as national Olympic games for which all sections of the country would train their young men. It would therefore serve as a powerful stimulus to

¹The Wadsworth Bill was passed by the Senate April 20. The provision for universal training was amended. The bill now provides for voluntary military and vocational training. But the universal training issue is regarded as postponed rather than as finally defeated.—EPROR.

all educational agencies to build up their own efficiency on their own initiative. The cost of this annual period of universal training would be approximately three hundred million dollars. The results would be the development of a citizen army entirely adequate for national defense, the cure of all native born illiteracy among males, the spread of American ideals throughout the population quickly, the development of a national sense of service and the achievement of an upstanding manhood for industrial production. It is practically assured that these ends would be secured because the Army's experience in the past two years has forced it to develop practical methods of doing this and the Army has demonstrated that it now knows how to carry this work to a successful conclusion.

C. R. MANN.

Some New Professional Standards for College Women

AFTER the concentrated effort of the war period and the inevitable slackening and uncertainty following it, we may appropriately take stock of our hurried achievement, make plans for future action, observe what participation in war activities has done for college women, what new outlooks and new methods may be carried over into college education, what contribution may be made to the common life of an industrial democracy that is just facing the part it has to play in the common life of the world.

From nine months' experience in Washington, trying to build up a Professional Section in the United States Employment Service and studying with zeal and admiration the activities of the remarkable group of men and women drawn into the war emergency services of the Government, I have come to this conclusion: that the greatest thing that college women have gained from their war experience is a new consciousness of themselves as professional workers measured objectively with other professional workers, both men and women, some of them college-trained, some of them not college-trained. Their work under pressure to meet large issues of transcendent and immediate importance has searched out both the strong and the weak points in their college education, and has shown them that the mere possession of a degree does not in itself confer professional standing. In a much more obscure and unformulated way, they have been groping for a modern and adequate definition of professional work and its relations to other types of work.

I wish first to outline what seem to me some of the elements in this new professional consciousness of college women; second, to make some rough suggestions toward a definition of the professional worker; and, third, to indicate two or three practical ways in which the professional worker may be made to contribute more directly and effectively to the productive effort of the new era upon which we are entering.

First, college women working here or abroad have had a sense of sharing in great events and great efforts. They have worked with men at common tasks and problems, and like men have learned to think nationally and internationally. Perhaps their thinking has been even fresher and truer because they have been less bound than men are by old entangling alliances of politics or business or finance. They have learned to think quickly and saliently in face of large emergencies, winnowing their education and experience for that which was pertinent to the matter in hand. All this has given them a courageous-mindedness and a fresh-mindedness that women are supposed to lack. And out of it has come that greatest of rewards of hard and successful work, a heightened sense of life and capacity, a power to translate thought into action that they did not know they possessed. The war has illustrated on a large scale William James' doctrine of the reserve energies of men.

They have also learned to hold steady under pressure, and what is more important, to hold others steady. A young major in the War Department, late a college dean, told me that he deliberately overworked each of the women under him for a brief time, in order to determine their limit of strain in handling themselves and others. Let us hope that his scientific spirit did not carry him too far. In general, they learned to lead and to plan for considerable groups of people, for whose work they were definitely responsible.

And they have gained command of many new subject-matters and techniques in the world of large affairs, industrial, commercial, political, social. I have been amazed at the numbers of young women who have come to me from the war-emergency services, from the many commodities sections of the War Industries Board, from the Shipping Board, from the War Trade Board, from the Food Administration, from the Statistical Division of the General Staff with technical and statistical equipment on the supply and distribution of raw materials and manufactures throughout the four quarters of the globe. They made tonnage and sailing charts; they drew up price-fixing tables; they plotted the movements of troops.

Along more usual lines of women's work, they devoted themselves to the maintaining and raising of working, living, and

health conditions under the stress of war, doing all these things, as never before, as matters of national policy and in cooperation with the ablest men in these fields. They have been industrial supervisors in factories under the Ordnance Department; inspectors of standards of products and working conditions in the manufacture of army clothing under the Quartermaster's Department; investigators and publicity workers under the War Labor Board and the War Labor Policies Board; supervisors and office managers under the War Emergency Employment Service. They have aided in maintaining military and civilian health and moral standards through the War and Navy Commission on Training Camp Activities, the War Camp Community Service, the Red Cross, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations. They have become experts in canteen and cafeteria management and in other types of "quantity feeding." They have directed new forms of group recreation.

Another amazing thing is that the majority of these women are so young! The leaders with whose names we have long been familiar have been at the head of many movements. But it is the young women under thirty who are the graduates of this wonderful new training-school of war-service, and who will carry the new professional standards and methods into the work that lies just ahead.

Second, how does this wealth of new experience and new attitude modify and enrich our conception of the professional worker? We had already got beyond the stage of limiting the term professional to doctors, lawyers and ministers, with a possible inclusion of engineers and teachers. But we have been uncertain about social workers and nurses and frankly hazy about employment managers and industrial counselors and mental hygienists and psychiatric social workers.

I am inclined to think that we must shift our thinking about the professional worker from the worker in certain recognized fields to the worker of a certain type and spirit in any field. In a very real sense, as the war has shown us, the professional worker is the liberally educated person in action, bringing all his resources of training and experience and personality to bear upon a specific problem of production or construction, whether in industry, business, health, or in any other of the manifold problems of human conduct.

Historically, our modern liberal education has been too dominantly an education for the consumer, for the person who has the chance to enjoy the goods of life, spiritual and intellectual as well as material. To make it an adequate education for the present time, it needs to be made also an education for the producer to develop the professional spirit of meeting the specific problem with large resources of knowledge and skill, to align the liberally educated person with the other workers of the world. By this I do not mean that we should turn our colleges into professional schools. The professional school must remain the place for acquiring the various complicated techniques that modern organized life demands. But I do mean that in our liberal education we should provide for some of the types of constructive thinking that have so marvelously developed the professional spirit, the spirit of intelligent workmanship, during the war. And who shall say that an understanding of the professional attitude and its satisfactions would not be one of the best clues to an understanding of modern life that we could give to those of our liberally educated who elect to remain merely consumers? I suspect that they will be fewer as time goes on.

In trying to work out a statement of the persons qualified to register in the Professional Section of the Employment Service, I essayed the following rough definition of the professional worker: "In general, a worker shall be considered professional who is equipped by ability, education, and experience to maintain and to improve standards of operation in the work in which he is engaged, to know both why it goes right and what to do when it goes wrong. He should feel an objective and disinterested intellectual interest in his work and a high sense of social responsibility, not only to his own group but to the community at large. He is therefore qualified to assume positions of increasing responsibility in one or more of the following capacities: (1) Administrative, executive, or managerial work, planning and carrying out serious undertakings; (2) expert work, investigation and research of all kinds, scientific, technical, economic, social; (3) special service work, teaching, social-service, library-work, journalism, publicity, work as agent or representative, etc. Workers doing routine work under the direction of others, using a merely mechanical operation or any skill or practice readily

learned and not requiring prolonged education or progressive experience, or the exercise of any considerable initiative or independent judgment, shall not be registered as professional workers unless they are undertaking such routine work with a definite professional purpose and for a limited time as apprentice workers. Among such non-professional workers shall be grouped the following, unless they present evidence to the contrary: Book-keepers, cashiers, clerks, commercial machine operators, foremen, inspectors and testers, retail salespeople, stenographers, telegraph and telephone operators, typists, etc."

Third, what are some of the practical ways in which we may strengthen the professional spirit and increase the usefulness to the community of the professional worker?

To my mind, one of the chief contributions that the war has made to the answering of this question comes from the Committee on Classification of Personnel of the War Department, which listed all the occupations necessary in the Army, devised a remarkable series of trade tests, and tested and rated thousands of men as apprentices, journeymen, and experts in the trades with which they professed to be familiar. They also drew up specifications for the many different types of officers required, and rated individual officers for specified qualities according to a simple and ingenious "living scale" made up of other officers, taken as standards for excellent, good, fair, poor, in these respects.

While the requirements of civilian professional life are far less stereotyped than those of military life, I think we shall make a real step in advance in our understanding and dealing with the modern professions and modern professional workers if we draw up specifications for the many different kinds of workers called for in each profession, with the general and special education required, the amount and kind of experience, including equivalent or substitute experience, a topic about which we have only just begun to think analytically, and the essential personal and intellectual qualities needed. Of course such specifications could never be used by any rule-of-thumb method. Human beings are never dealt with successfully in that way. But I believe that we are at the beginning of a revolutionary era in the handling of problems of personnel. Think what light would be thrown on such blanket-terms as social service and teaching! The Committee

on Classification of Personnel listed and described thirty-nine varieties of chemists needed in the Army. Perhaps we shall come to giving all applicants for professional positions intelligence tests similar to those worked out by the psychologists for the army and now being tried in many colleges as a means of checking examinations and other academic estimates. If we do, I should insist that they likewise be given to prospective employers! And think what an illuminating and chastening experience it would be for most of us to be classified as apprentices, journeymen, or experts in our chosen fields.

Still another step that I think we must take at once in the interests of establishing professional status is a study of salary ranges and rates of promotion and salary increase in the various professions. The high cost of living has upset all our old ideas, which were certainly vague and unstandardized enough. We should be able to say something of this sort: From \$1,000 to \$1,200 is a fair apprentice wage; from \$1,200 to \$2,000 is a fair journeyman wage; from \$2,000 up is a fair expert wage. (I should like to set these figures forward to \$1,200 to \$1,500 for apprentices, \$1,500 to \$2,500 for journeymen, above \$2,500 for experts.)

I am firmly convinced of the need of a permanent system of country-wide labor-exchanges and of the importance of including in such a system an adequate service for professional workers. They are an especially mobile group going easily from one part of the country to the other, and so are especially in need of a national system of circulating opportunities, applicants, and other information. An astute observer pointed out to me not long ago that the two ends of the labor scale are the most mobile, casual workers and professional workers, reminding me that an old professor of mine used to maintain that tramps, gamblers, and artists all belonged to the "parasitic classes." For professional workers there is a real equivalent to "waiting at the factory gate." And what college president or other executive will deny that he sometimes frequents the meetings of learned associations for the purpose of sounding the "labor reservoir?"

Professional workers need the socializing experience of being part of a system that handles all groups of workers and studies the varying requirements of production and of the worker. Thus

may they be led to see their place in any system of true "guild socialism." On the other hand, they make a real contribution to a public employment service through helping to overcome the popular notion that such a service is only for the unskilled or the "jobless," an "unemployment service," as one of our employment leaders has well put it, instead of a constructive social agency paralleling in importance a constructive system of public education.

My concluding suggestion for strengthening professional standards is this: that we have much to learn with regard to educational apprenticeship as a valuable educational method. Why should we not use the two last summer vacations of the undergraduate years—the war has shown us that no well person needs more than a month's vacation—for eight weeks of "shop practice," of actual contact with problems and procedures of production or organization for our ablest students? Factories, banks, social agencies, county farm bureaus, etc., would all furnish such opportunities. Let them be made as desirable and as much a matter of pride to the recipients as other more purely academic awards. Let them be given only after the meeting of the highest requirements of health, scholarship, and personal fitness. Let them be a matter of joint educational agreement between the agency and the college departments concerned so that there may be no danger of exploitation of the untried worker. At first, let the experiment be tried sparingly, and carefully watched and studied as an "educational project." I am convinced that it would yield significant results. It has already yielded them in certain limited cases.

ELIZABETH KEMPER ADAMS.

University Problems¹

A SITUATION has arisen which makes it impossible that this, the only general professional society of university teachers, should any longer ignore the economic side of the teacher's calling. The long-continued and steady rise of prices, greatly increased by the war, has as yet been accompanied by no corresponding increase in college and university salaries. While the cost of living has advanced (by the most moderate estimates) between 40 and 70 per cent, and the wages of skilled manual labor frequently in equal and occasionally in greater proportion, the nominal compensation of the scholar has in many cases remained unchanged, and in actual compensation—his "real wage"—has consequently decreased, often to an alarming degree. Meanwhile thousands of members of the profession have, during the war, had experience of new employments, and many have discovered their ability to earn much larger incomes in other callings. At the same time there has arisen a greatly increased demand for the services of men of scientific training in industry, commerce, government and finance. The joint result of these several tendencies constitutes a grave menace to the future efficiency of the American universities. Large numbers of young men of energy and ability have already been lost to the profession through these causes; and it will inevitably be increasingly difficult to recruit, or to retain, men of the highest abilities, either as teachers or investigators, so long as the economic rewards of the profession are not only greatly inferior to those obtainable in other vocations open to men of the same education and aptitudes, but are in themselves insufficient to permit the rearing of a family at the standard of living hitherto customary even among teachers.

The question of professorial salaries, therefore—whatever may once have been true of it—no longer concerns merely the private interests of teachers; it has come to be—I choose the

¹Portions of the annual message of the president of the American Association of University Professors reprinted from the bulletin of the association.

words with careful consideration—among the most critical and most pregnant questions of general social policy. The fact that this is not generally recognized by the public at large merely means that the public at large remains incredibly oblivious of the part played by exact scientific knowledge in the entire economy of modern life. Back of almost all the material wealth by which the twentieth century, in western Europe and America, surpasses the fifteenth or sixteenth century, stands the work of the inventor; and back of all the work of the inventor stands that of the investigator of natural laws. Captains of industry may “organize,” and “labor” may toil; but not all the “organizing ability” in the world, nor all the sweat of countless myriads of toilers, could have effected the transformation of the external conditions of human existence which has taken place within the past three hundred years, and chiefly within the past century. That transformation is primarily the work of the men of the laboratory and the study. And from no other conceivable source can we expect any general and substantial amelioration of the conditions of human existence in the future. A mere change in the *per capita* distribution of the wealth or the collective income of the men living in Europe in the sixteenth century would perhaps have done something, but it would, by itself, have done exceedingly little, to improve the lot of the average man. A mere change in distribution of the larger wealth or collective income of the larger populations now living in Europe and America, would perhaps do more, but (as is statistically demonstrable) it would still do relatively little, to improve the condition of the average man. Such improvement on a great scale can only come through increased production of the means of comfort, of security, of enjoyment, of control over natural forces. And—in the words of a distinguished member of the Association—“increase of productivity from the use of the same given number of acres, same number of hours of labor, or even the desirable fewer hours, from the same amount of rainfall and sunlight, and in the face of whatever other naturally fixed conditions there may be, can be effected, and effected only, by acquiring more scientific knowledge and using more of what is already known.” And not less indispensable to mankind than an increasing dominion over physical nature is an increasing, and increasingly diffused, wisdom in the exercise of that dominion

and in the discovery of the arrangements and adjustments necessary if, under the external conditions created by nature and by modern applied science, men are to live together on this planet with a measure of happiness, with mutual good will, and with such seemliness and dignity of behavior as befit beings calling themselves "rational." We have all of late been forced, by the most tragically convincing of evidence, to realize that man's progress in social wisdom has so little kept pace with his progress in physical science that the latter has done far less than it had been expected to do to increase the worth and happiness of human life, and has often seemed to serve only to render human folly the more spectacular and the more suicidal. In the future, then, the well-being of men must increasingly depend, not only upon the work of the analyst of physical processes, but also upon the work of the disinterested analyst and interpreter of human experience and of human nature.

Obviously, then, the maintenance of the highest possible level of energy and competency in the men and institutions especially dedicated to these fundamental tasks is a matter of the deepest concern to any civilized community. And such a level cannot be permanently maintained by a total disregard of the ordinary economic motives which influence men in the choice of a profession—by compelling men who adopt this calling to do so at the sacrifice of the economic security and the future prospects of their children. While it is true that there are some men whose vocation for scientific inquiry, or possibly for teaching, is so irresistible that not even actual destitution could keep them from those pursuits, society would be exceedingly ill-advised to assume that these men exist in such numbers as to provide a sufficient number of recruits, of adequate abilities, for the work of research and of teaching. And even in the case of those already in the profession, insufficient salaries mean inferior work, since, as a member of the Association has remarked, they tempt to "pot-boiling, instead of research," converting men who should be engaged in serious intellectual enterprises into compilers of superfluous elementary text-books or hack-workers at the routine industrial or commercial applications of their sciences.

Fortunately, there is no danger that nothing will be done to meet this situation. All the more far-seeing college and university

executives and governing boards are aware of its gravity; the alumni of many institutions have already started movements to raise funds, in some cases amounting to several millions of dollars, for increasing salaries; and some state legislatures have made special appropriations for the same purpose. There is, however, danger that in many cases *not enough* will be done. An increase in the prices of necessities of 40 to 70 per cent is not offset by a 10 or 20 per cent increase of salaries. The teacher still remains far worse remunerated than he was four or five years ago. And there is a good deal to indicate that, in many institutions, a 10 or 20 per cent increase is all that is contemplated, and that when this is accomplished those in charge of the financial management will sit down with an agreeable feeling of having done something pretty handsome for the professors! It is, of course, not necessarily the fault of the executive or of the governing board if the constituency of an institution refuses to furnish funds sufficient to maintain the real remuneration of its teachers at least at the former level. But it is their fault, and also that of the teachers, if they ask of their constituencies less than is necessary for that purpose; if they fail to make clear all that is at stake in the business; or if they neglect to point out that there is nothing in the general commercial and industrial situation which renders it impossible that the sums necessary to save American scientific work, and the teaching efficiency of American colleges, from serious and rapid deterioration should be forthcoming.

II. *Professorial Trade-Unionism*

It is doubtless the deplorable economic situation of not a few of the younger teachers—and of some no longer young—that chiefly accounts for an agitation which has shown itself during the past year in some quarters, in favor of adhesion by members of university and college faculties to the American Federation of Teachers, which is a “trade union” affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Some members of the Association have written the officers asking their opinions as to the propriety of university teachers joining this body, and others have suggested that the Association itself affiliate with the American Federation of Labor. Since the Association has never formulated any judgment upon the subject, no official answers to these inquiries could be given. But this is perhaps a suitable occasion for submitting,

for the consideration of the members, the personal views of this year's president upon the question. The movement seems sufficiently important, especially in some sections of the country, to justify a serious examination of the issues it raises.

What is proposed is not merely that members of college faculties shall adhere as individuals to a national teachers' union, but that organized "locals" shall be formed in as many colleges and universities as possible; and the eventual result aimed at is, of course, the inclusion of the majority of teachers in each institution in the local union—though I am not aware that the issue of the closed shop has as yet been raised. If the purposes of those interested in the plan should be realized, therefore, the greater part of the profession would be "unionized," and would naturally be assumed, both by members of other trade unions and by non-unionists, to be committed in advance to a general support of the policies and activities of the American Federation of Labor.

In my opinion, this project not only is likely to be futile, but, in the degree to which it should succeed, would diminish the usefulness and hamper the freedom of our profession, and would be most of all detrimental to the objects which the supporters of the proposal presumably have in mind.²

My reason for this opinion consists in no antagonism to trade-unionism as such. The indispensability of collective bargaining for the wage-earner is no longer open to debate among sensible men; and there can be no effective collective bargaining unless there exist strong and well-organized unions, which include in their membership at least a large proportion of the workers at a given trade in each locality. If I were a worker at a manual trade I should assuredly be a member of the union of my trade, unless some seriously corrupt conditions obtained in that union; and I should look with no kindly eye upon workers who refused to support the union while profiting by the efforts and sacrifices made by its members. Nor, of course, is there anything but a silly snobbishness in the feeling that it would somehow be incongruous or unseemly for members of our learned profession to

²Nothing in what follows is intended to bear upon the question of the advisability of the "unionizing" of public school teachers. Such teachers have their own distinctive problems, varying in different communities; and upon these I do not presume to express an opinion.

adhere to an organization composed chiefly of manual workers. On the contrary, the most attractive feature of the project of "professorial unionism" seems to me to be the possibility which it contains of a somewhat closer acquaintance and a better understanding between the man of the study or the laboratory and the man of the workshop, the mill or the mine. Such a closer acquaintance should, I conceive, be advantageous to both. Nevertheless, there seem to me to be three decisive reasons, arising out of the special character or the present circumstances of our profession, which make it the part of wisdom for university teachers to be organized in an independent professional body, rather than as a part of a national federation of labor unions.

1. It is fairly certain that, for good reasons or for bad, many university teachers, probably a great majority of them, will not in the near future become members of a teachers' trade union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. It is, however, eminently desirable that, both for the purpose of discussion of their common professional problems, and for purposes of action, all members of college or university faculties should be united in a single representative body. An organization of university teachers will possess influence precisely in proportion as it is representative; the utterances of a dissident faction are likely to carry little weight with the public or with the governing boards of institutions. Other things being equal, therefore, that form of organization is to be preferred in which the largest possible number of members of the profession can be united.

Nor is it the fact, as some appear to suppose, that an organization which is widely representative and includes in its membership men and women of nearly all shades of opinion upon educational and social questions, will necessarily be incapable of agreeing upon any common program, except one of futile platitudes; or that it will be impotent to act with energy in behalf of such programs as it may adopt. The history of this Association, during the five years since its formation, is there to prove the contrary. It has been demonstrated that there already exists, on a number of matters of vital interest to American education and to the teaching profession, a very extensive consensus of professional opinion; that this consensus covers several important reforms which in many, perhaps in most, institutions have

yet to be accomplished; that eventual agreement upon other questions may reasonably be expected, as the reports of committees on those questions are presented and are discussed by the Association; and that the Association is an effective mouth-piece for any conclusions upon which a substantial majority of its members are agreed. Certainly it is capable of being an incomparably more powerful agency for promoting many purposes still in need of organized and persistent effort than any organization of a limited and special group can possibly be.

There is a counsel of elementary and, as one would have supposed, obvious practical wisdom, which is too often ignored by reformers of ardent temperament, whether in education or other matters. If a man is convinced of the necessity of six reforms, and if upon three of these he can easily persuade most of his neighbors to join with him, then—supposing him to be sincerely desirous of getting results and not merely of giving utterance to his personal dissatisfactions—he cannot hesitate as to the course to follow. He will devote himself first to a realization of those proposals which command, or which by a little effort can be made to command, the support of the majority; and he will cooperate with his neighbors upon this immediate program until it is accomplished. A man of sense will the more certainly do this if his more widely acceptable proposals are necessary or desirable preliminaries to the realization of the others; and if the carrying out of his immediate program seems likely to leave his neighbors in a state of mind less unfavorable to his ulterior projects. This general consideration has, I think, a good deal of pertinency to the case of those college or university teachers who are disposed to dissociate themselves from the general body of their colleagues, for fear lest a truly comprehensive and representative professional organization should not embrace at once the whole of some program or set of principles in which they earnestly believe. If any group supporting such a program—with respect to any questions pertinent to educational or professional policy—cannot persuade the majority of their own colleagues of its desirability, they are not very likely to persuade others; nor can they have any claim to address the public as authoritative representatives of the views of the university teachers of the country. They would do an ill service to all of us,

and to causes in which virtually all of us believe, who should now seek to divide our forces.

2. A trade union is commonly understood to be, and usually is, an organization primarily and preponderantly, if not exclusively, economic both in its objects and in its means of accomplishing them. Its characteristic aim is to increase the wages, diminish the hours of labor, and improve the working conditions of its members, chiefly by the application of some form of economic force—usually by the method of collective bargaining. It is, of course, as I have already said, entirely legitimate for the wage-earner thus to aim at the improvement of his economic position, and to use this means of offsetting the strategic inferiority in which he would otherwise be placed in bargaining with employers for the sale of his services. But it is not legitimate, as it seems to me, that the general professional organization of university teachers and investigators should exist primarily for the purpose of increasing the salaries of its members, or that its characteristic and engrossing business should be the application, to this end, of methods of economic pressure. It is true that university teachers—like clergymen, and unlike attorneys, physicians, and artists—are employes, and that their economic position is, therefore, in certain respects the same as that of wage-earners. But they are not, as a rule, employes of establishments conducted for the private profit of individuals. They are responsible officers of institutions created by the state or by the voluntary gifts of other men for public ends—for the maintenance of one of the highest and most important functions in the life of society. To this function the members of our profession are set apart by special and prolonged training. Of this great interest of civilization, as I have already remarked, they, more than the men of any other calling, are the custodians. Members of other professions may properly enough be trustees of a university. But it is the body of teachers within the university who are the trustees of the things for which the university exists; and of that trusteeship they cannot divest themselves. Their relation to their employment, therefore, differs essentially from that of the wage-earner bargaining with the private capitalist over the division of the profits of industry. It follows that the first concern and controlling purpose of a

general professional organization of university and college teachers must be to enable the profession, and the institutions in which its members are associated, to discharge their distinctive function in the economy of modern society with the highest possible degree of competency and serviceableness.

There is nothing in such a purpose which requires us to pretend that professors and their offspring live on manna from heaven, or that scholars have by nature an eccentric taste for being ill-paid. The efficiency of the profession, and, especially, the number and quality of its recruits, depend, as has already been pointed out, in no negligible degree upon its economic condition. An organization like ours may, and must, demand that the economic condition of the university teacher not only shall be such as to permit him to carry on his work with reasonable security and comfort and without distracting anxieties, but shall also be such as to attract into the vocation of the teacher and investigator a sufficient number of the most highly endowed youth of each generation. But it would be almost a crowning evidence of a decline of liberal interests among men if we—considering in what activities we are daily occupied and to what needs of mankind we are ministers—should make it the essential object and chief preoccupation of our associated effort to drive bargains for the increase of our pecuniary rewards, whether by means of implicit threats of withholding our service, or by other means.

3. There remains a third and not less decisive objection to the "unionizing" of university teachers. It applies especially to the case of teachers of the social sciences; but it will, I take it, hardly be contended that organizations necessarily excluding them should be formed by other teachers. The professional investigator of social problems ought to avoid entangling permanent alliances with any of the purely economic groups which are now struggling with one another to retain or to increase their shares of the social dividend. Precisely those reasons which require that such an investigator shall be free to utter his conclusions without being in any degree subject to the censorship either of the political functionaries of the state or of private benefactors of universities, also require that he refrain from identifying himself with powerful bodies representing organized special interests, whether of capital or labor. His interest should be solely that of the community at large and in the long run. Not only should it be so in

fact; but, if his conclusions are to gain the hearing and have the influence which they ought to have, he must take care to give no reasonable ground for the belief that they are dictated by any other interest. He must, therefore, avoid all commitments which will be commonly understood to bind him in advance to give his support always to one side, in the fluctuating fortunes of the economic warfare which is now going on and, unhappily, seems likely to continue for many decades. If, indeed, it were the case that trade unions represented exclusively a neglected, needy and down-trodden class, or if it could safely be assumed *a priori* that in the future all the demands of organized labor will be just and all its policies wise, it might be well for specialists in the social sciences, as such, to identify themselves unqualifiedly with this group. But it is a patent fact that the great organizations of skilled labor have now grown so powerful that—like all bodies which attain great power, especially if their principal object is the promotion of their own economic advantage—they now contain the potency of grave injury as well as of great service to the general interests of the community. When, in any particular controversy, the trade unions have a just cause, the economist or social philosopher will be to them a far more effective ally if he speaks, not as a trade-unionist, but as an unbiased student of the question at issue, owing no special favors to either side. When, in any particular controversy, the trade unions have not a just cause, the economist or social philosopher, obviously, not only ought not to be their ally, but he ought not to be in a position which, if he opposes their policy, will lay him open to plausible charges of disloyalty to an organization to which he belongs and from which he has received benefits. Above all, the special student of social and economic problems ought to avoid any affiliation which will disqualify him from serving as a mediator between, or a disinterested counsellor of, both parties to the industrial struggle. There is, in short, exactly the same *kind* of reason—I do not raise the question of degree—against adhesion by scholars as a body to the American Federation of Labor as there is against their adhesion as a body to the National Industrial Conference Board or any similar organization of employers. In the one case as in the other, they would diminish their capacity and opportunity to render, in the grave difficulties of our time, the special and needful service which belongs distinctively to their profession.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY.

Accredited Higher Institutions

IT IS well known that there are great differences in the academic standards of American colleges. Certain institutions with full authority of law bear the name "college" or "university" which are not equipped either with professors or materials to offer instruction of the grade commonly recognized as collegiate.

This situation has led to numerous attempts at classification of higher institutions. A large number of agencies, such as State Departments of Education, state universities and voluntary professional associations, have prepared lists of institutions whose standards they are willing to approve. The criteria applied by these bodies vary. Several of the agencies, however, are in substantial agreement as to the resources which should be possessed and the minimum academic requirements which should be imposed by institutions claiming to rank as colleges. Obviously it would be advantageous to the American educational public if all classifying and standardizing bodies would adopt the same criteria. It would also simplify for foreign institutions the task of evaluating American credentials. Pending the establishment of such agreement among standardizing agencies, the American Council on Education is ready to recommend to foreign institutions certain lists of accredited or approved institutions as having been prepared on reliable information and as being based on definitions of collegiate standards and resources which represent the best American practice.

The institutions named below are those accredited by one or more of the four following agencies:

The Association of American Universities.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States.

The University of California.

It is believed that foreign universities may safely accept a

well-recommended graduate in arts and sciences¹ of one of these institutions as qualified for entrance upon advanced study leading to the Doctor's degree, or to other higher degrees. A statement of the criteria applied by each of these four bodies follows the list.

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
ALABAMA	
University of Alabama	University
ARIZONA	
University of Arizona	Tucson
CALIFORNIA	
California Institute of Technology	Pasadena
Leland Stanford, Jr., University	Stanford University
Mills College	Mills College
Occidental College	Los Angeles
Pomona College	Claremont
University of California	Berkeley
University of Southern California	Los Angeles
COLORADO	
Colorado Agricultural College	Fort Collins
Colorado College	Colorado Springs
University of Colorado	Boulder
University of Denver	University Park
CONNECTICUT	
Trinity College	Hartford
Wesleyan University	Middletown
Yale University	New Haven
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Catholic University of America	Washington, D. C.
George Washington University	Washington, D. C.
Georgetown University	Washington, D. C.
Trinity College	Washington, D. C.

¹It should be noted that this list contains primarily colleges of arts and sciences. Only a few engineering schools or other technical institutions are included, as a rule because they offer general arts and science curricula, as well as technical curricula. The list will not serve as a guide to a just estimate of technical institutions in the United States.

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
FLORIDA	
Florida State College for Women	Tallahassee
John R. Stetson University	Deland
University of Florida	Gainesville
GEORGIA	
Agnes Scott College	Decatur
Emory University	Oxford
Mercer University	Macon
University of Georgia	Athens
Wesleyan College	Macon
IDAHO	
University of Idaho	Moscow
ILLINOIS	
Armour Institute of Technology	Chicago
Augustana College	Rock Island
Carthage College	Carthage
Illinois College	Jacksonville
Illinois Wesleyan University	Bloomington
Illinois Woman's College	Jacksonville
James Millikin University	Decatur
Knox College	Galesburg
Lake Forest College	Lake Forest
Lewis Institute	Chicago
Lombard College	Galesburg
Monmouth College	Monmouth
Northwestern College	Naperville
Northwestern University	Evanston
Rockford College	Rockford
University of Chicago	Chicago
University of Illinois	Urbana
Wheaton College	Wheaton
INDIANA	
Butler College	Indianapolis
De Pauw University	Greencastle
Earlham College	Earlham
Franklin College	Franklin
Hanover College	Hanover
Indiana State Normal School	Terre Haute
Indiana University	Bloomington
Purdue University	Lafayette
Rose Polytechnic Institute	Terre Haute
St. Mary of the Woods	Terre Haute
University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame
Wabash College	Crawfordsville

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
IOWA	
Coe College	Cedar Rapids
Cornell College	Mount Vernon
Drake University	Des Moines
Dubuque College	Dubuque
Grinnell College	Grinnell
Iowa State College of Agri. and Mech. Arts	Ames
Iowa State Teachers' College	Cedar Falls
Iowa Wesleyan College	Mt. Pleasant
Luther College	Decorah
Morningside College	Sioux City
Parsons College	Fairfield
Penn College	Oskaloosa
Simpson College	Indianola
State University of Iowa	Iowa City
Upper Iowa University	Fayette
Union College of Iowa	Des Moines
KANSAS	
Baker University	Baldwin
Bethany College	Lindsborg
College of Emporia	Emporia
Fairmount College	Wichita
Friends University	Wichita
Kansas State Agricultural College	Manhattan
Midland College	Atchison
Ottawa University	Ottawa
Southwestern College	Winfield
University of Kansas	Lawrence
Washburn College	Topeka
KENTUCKY	
Central University of Kentucky	Danville
Georgetown College	Georgetown
Transylvania College	Lexington
University of Louisville	Louisville
University of Kentucky	Lexington
LOUISIANA	
Louisiana State University	Baton Rouge
Tulane University of Louisiana	New Orleans
MAINE	
Bates College	Lewiston
Bowdoin College	Brunswick

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
Colby College	Waterville
University of Maine	Orono

MARYLAND

Goucher College	Baltimore
Johns Hopkins University	Baltimore
Loyola College	Baltimore
Maryland State College	College Park
Mt. St. Mary's College	Emmitsburg
Rock Hill College	Ellicott City
St. John's College	Annapolis
Washington College	Chestertown
Western Maryland College	Westminster

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst College	Amherst
Boston College	Boston
Boston University	Boston
Clark College	Worcester
Clark University	Worcester
Harvard University	Cambridge
Holy Cross College	Worcester
Mass. Agricultural College	Amherst
Mass. Institute of Technology	Cambridge
Mount Holyoke College	South Hadley
Radcliffe College	Cambridge
Smith College	Northampton
Tufts College	Tufts College
Wellesley College	Wellesley
Williams College	Williamstown
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Worcester

MICHIGAN

Adrian College	Adrian
Albion College	Albion
Alma College	Alma
Hillsdale College	Hillsdale
Hope College	Holland
Kalamazoo College	Kalamazoo
Michigan Agricultural College	East Lansing
Michigan College of Mines	Houghton
Olivet College	Olivet
University of Detroit	Detroit
University of Michigan	Ann Arbor

MINNESOTA

Carleton College	Northfield
College of St. Catherine	St. Paul

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
College of St. Teresa	Winona
College of St. Thomas	St. Paul
Gustavus Adolphus College	St. Peter
Hamline University	St. Paul
Macalester College	St. Paul
St. Olaf College	Northfield
University of Minnesota	Minneapolis

MISSISSIPPI

Millsaps College	Jackson
University of Mississippi	University

MISSOURI

Central College	Fayette
Drury College	Springfield
Missouri Valley College	Marshall
Missouri Wesleyan College	Cameron
Park College	Parkville
St. Louis University	St. Louis
Tarkio College	Tarkio
University of Missouri	Columbia
Washington University	St. Louis
Westminster College	Fulton
William Jewell College	Liberty

MONTANA

Montana State College of Agriculture & Mechanic Arts	Bozeman
University of Montana	Missoula

NEBRASKA

Bellevue College	Bellevue
Cotner University	Bethany
Creighton University	Omaha
Doane University	Crete
Grand Island College	Grand Island
Hastings College	Hastings
Nebraska Wesleyan University	University Place
Union College	College View
University of Nebraska	Lincoln
University of Omaha	Omaha
York College	York

NEVADA

University of Nevada	Reno
----------------------	------

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Dartmouth College	Hanover
New Hampshire College of Agri. and Mechanic Arts.	Durham
NEW JERSEY	
College of St. Elizabeth	Convent Station
Princeton University	Princeton
Rutgers College	New Brunswick
Stevens Inst. of Technology	Hoboken
NEW MEXICO	
New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	State College
NEW YORK	
Adelphi College	Brooklyn
Alfred University	Alfred
Barnard College	New York City
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	Brooklyn
Canisius College	Buffalo
Cathedral College	New York City
Clarkson School of Technology	Potsdam
Colgate University	Hamilton
College of the City of New York	New York City
Columbia University	New York City
Cornell University	Ithaca
D'Youville College	Buffalo
Elmira College	Elmira
Fordham University	Fordham
Hamilton College	Clinton
Hobart College	Geneva
Hunter College	New York City
Manhattan College	New York City
New York State Teachers' College	Albany
New York University	New York City
Niagara University	Niagara University
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	New York City
St. Francis Xavier College	Troy
St. John's College	Brooklyn
St. Lawrence University	Canton
St. Stephen's College	Annandale
Syracuse University	Syracuse
Union University	Schenectady
University of Rochester	Rochester
Vassar College	Poughkeepsie
Wells College	Aurora

Name of Institution *Location*

NORTH CAROLINA

Davidson College	Davidson
Trinity College	Durham
University of North Carolina	Chapel Hill
Wake Forest College	Wake Forest

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota Agricultural College	Agricultural College
Fargo College	Fargo
Jamestown College	Jamestown
University of North Dakota	University

OHIO

Baldwin Wallace College	Berea
Case School of Applied Science	Cleveland
College of Wooster	Wooster
Defiance College	Defiance
Dennison University	Granville
Heidelberg University	Tiffin
Hiram College	Hiram
Kenyon College	Gambier
Lake Erie College	Painesville
Marietta College	Marietta
Miami University	Oxford
Municipal University of Akron	Akron
Mt. Union College	Alliance
Muskingum College	New Concord
Oberlin College	Oberlin
Ohio State University	Columbus
Ohio University	Athens
Ohio Wesleyan University	Delaware
Otterbein University	Westerville
University of Cincinnati	Cincinnati
Western College for Women	Oxford
Western Reserve University	Cleveland
Wittenberg College	Springfield

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	Stillwater
Oklahoma College for Women	Chickasha
University of Oklahoma	Norman

OREGON

Pacific University	Forest Grove
Reed College	Portland

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
University of Oregon	Eugene
Willamette University	Salem
PENNSYLVANIA	
Allegheny College	Meadville
Bryn Mawr College	Bryn Mawr
Bucknell University	Lewisburg
Dickinson College	Carlisle
Franklin and Marshall College	Lancaster
Haverford College	Haverford
Lafayette College	Easton
Lebanon Valley College	Annaville
Muhlenburg College	Allentown
Lehigh University	South Bethlehem
Pennsylvania College	Gettysburg
Pennsylvania State College	State College
Susquehanna University	Selinsgrove
Swarthmore College	Swarthmore
Temple University	Philadelphia
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia
University of Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh
Ursinus College	Collegeville
Washington and Jefferson College	Washington
Wilson College	Chambersburg
RHODE ISLAND	
Brown University	Providence
SOUTH CAROLINA	
College of Charleston	Charleston
Converse College	Spartanburg
University of South Carolina	Columbia
Wofford College	Spartanburg
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Dakota Wesleyan University	Mitchell
Huron College	Huron
South Dakota College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	Brookings
University of South Dakota	Vermillion
Yankton College	Yankton
TENNESSEE	
George Peabody College for Teachers	Nashville
Maryville College	Maryville
Southwestern Presbyterian Univ.	Clarksville
University of Chattanooga	Chattanooga

<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Location</i>
University of Tennessee	Knoxville
University of the South	Sewanee
Vanderbilt University	Nashville
TEXAS	
Baylor University	Waco
Southwestern University	Georgetown
Rice Institute	Houston
Trinity University	Waxahachie
University of Texas	Austin
UTAH	
University of Utah	Salt Lake City
VERMONT	
Middlebury College	Middlebury
University of Vermont	Burlington
VIRGINIA	
College of William and Mary	Williamsburg
Emory and Henry College	Emory
Hampden-Sidney College	Hampden-Sidney
Randolph-Macon College	Ashland
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	Lynchburg
Richmond College	Richmond
Roanoke College	Salem
University of Virginia	Charlottesville
Washington and Lee University	Lexington
WASHINGTON	
State College of Washington	Pullman
University of Washington	Seattle
Whitman College	Walla Walla
WEST VIRGINIA	
West Virginia University	Morgantown
WISCONSIN	
Beloit College	Beloit
Carróll College	Waukesha
Lawrence College	Appleton
Marquette University	Milwaukee
Milton College	Milton
Milwaukee-Downer College	Milwaukee
Northwestern College	Watertown
Ripon College	Ripon
St. Clara College	Sinsinawa
University of Wisconsin	Madison
WYOMING	
University of Wyoming	Laramie

CRITERIA OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

In 1917 the Association of American Universities published a revision of its list of accepted colleges and universities. The list was preceded by the following statement:

The Association of American Universities approves the following revision of the list of universities and colleges accepted and approved by the Association in 1913, in connection with the following resolution adopted by the Association at that time:

Resolved, That this Association recommend to the Prussian *Kultusministerium* and the corresponding ministries of the other German states, that, for the present, there be recognized as the equivalent of the German *Maturitätszeugnis* not only the Bachelor's degrees conferred by the members of the Association, but also the degrees of those other American colleges and universities which are on the accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation, or which are certified by this Foundation as of equivalent standing, but excluded from its accepted list for other than educational reasons.

The revision here presented has been made by the Committee on Classification of Colleges appointed by the Association to continue the work begun in 1913. The Association recognizes the institutions in this undifferentiated list as falling within the three groups described by the Association in 1914 in the following terms:

Group A. Institutions whose graduates should ordinarily be admitted to the graduate schools of this Association for work in lines for which they have had adequate undergraduate preparation, with a reasonable presumption that advanced degrees may be taken with the minimum amount of prescribed work and in the minimum time prescribed. Students who choose work in lines for which their undergraduate course has not prepared them adequately must expect to take more time and do additional work.

Group B. Institutions from which only those graduates of high standing in their classes who are individually recommended by the department of undergraduate instruction corresponding to that in which they purpose to do their graduate work, may be admitted on the same basis as graduates from the institutions in Group A.

Group C. Other institutions whose graduates should be admitted to graduate schools, but with the presumption that more than the minimum time and minimum amount of work will be ordinarily required for an advanced degree.

Graduates of these institutions (in the case of newer and smaller institutions, the graduates of recent classes) will have presumption of admission, with the limitations and reservations stated above, to graduate status or citizenship, but without commitment as to the equivalency of the Bachelor's degree of an individual student with that of the university admitting him and without commitment as to the time that will be required by such student to secure an advanced degree.

CRITERIA OF THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The standard American college is a college with a four-year curriculum with a tendency to differentiate its parts in such a way that the first two years are a continuation of, and a supplement to, the work of secondary instruction as given in the high school, while the last two years are shaped more or less distinctly in the direction of special, professional, or university instruction.

The following constitute the standards for accrediting colleges for the present year (1919):

1. The minimum scholastic requirement of all college teachers shall be equivalent to graduation from a college belonging to this association, and graduate work equal at least to that required for a master's degree. Graduate study and training in research equivalent to that required for the Ph. D. degree are urgently recommended, but the teacher's success is to be determined by the efficiency of his teaching, as well as by his research work.

2. The college shall require for admission not less than 15 secondary units as defined by this association.

3. The college shall require not less than 120 semester hours for graduation.

4. The college shall be provided with library and laboratory equipment sufficient to develop fully and illustrate each course announced.

5. The college, if a corporate institution, shall possess a productive endowment of not less than \$200,000.

6. The college, if a tax-supported institution, shall receive an annual income of not less than \$50,000.

7. The college shall maintain at least eight distinct depart-

ments in liberal arts, each with at least one professor giving full time to the college work in that department.

8. The location and construction of the buildings, the lighting, heating, and ventilation of the rooms, the nature of the laboratories, corridors, closets, water supply, school furniture, apparatus, and methods of cleaning shall be such as to insure hygienic conditions for both students and teachers.

9. The number of hours of work given by each teacher will vary in the different departments. To determine this, the amount of preparation required for the class and the time needed for study to keep abreast of the subject, together with the number of students, must be taken into account; but in no case shall more than eighteen hours per week be required, fifteen being recommended as a maximum.

10. The college must be able to prepare its graduates to enter recognized graduate schools as candidates for advanced degrees.

11. The college should limit the number of students in a recitation or laboratory class to thirty.

12. The character of the curriculum, the efficiency of instruction, the scientific spirit, the standard for regular degrees, the conservatism in granting honorary degrees, and the tone of the institution shall also be factors in determining eligibility.

13. No institution shall be admitted to the approved list unless it has a total registration of at least fifty students if it reports itself as a junior college and of at least one hundred students if it carries courses beyond the junior college.

14. When an institution has, in addition to the College of Liberal Arts, professional or technical schools or departments, the College of Liberal Arts shall not be accepted for the approved list of the Association unless the professional or technical departments are of an acceptable grade.

CRITERIA OF THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES

The by-laws relating to the requirements for membership in the Association constitute a definition of a standard college. The membership list of the Association is made up of institutions located in the southern states which conform to these requirements:

1. No college belonging to this Association shall maintain a preparatory school as part of its college organization. In case such school is maintained under the college charter, it must be kept rigidly distinct in students, faculty, and discipline.

2. The completion of a secondary-school course, covering at least the amount of work indicated in section 3 of these by-laws, should be demanded of every student seeking admission to college. In measuring the amount of work done by such students the association accepts the valuation of a unit as fixed by the National Conference Committee on Standards as follows:

A unit represents a year's study in any subject in a secondary school, constituting approximately a quarter of a full year's work.

This statement is designed to afford a standard of measurement for the work done in secondary schools. It takes the four-year high-school course as a basis and assumes that the length of the school year is from 36 to 40 weeks, that a period is from 40 to 60 minutes in length, and that the study is pursued for four or five periods a week; but under ordinary circumstances a satisfactory year's work in any subject can not be accomplished in less than 120 sixty-minute hours or their equivalent. Schools organized on any other than a four-year basis can, nevertheless, estimate their work in terms of this unit.

3. Fourteen units are required of all students admitted to college. Conditions are allowed to the extent of two units only, and all conditions or deficiencies should be removed before the beginning of the second year in college. College work done to remove conditions must not be counted toward a degree. Students may be admitted either on certificate or on examination, but they must in all cases comply with the above requirements as to the amount of work offered. The association strongly recommends that all candidates be required to offer English and mathematics, and that all candidates for a degree course in the college of liberal arts be required to offer in addition the necessary preparation in two foreign languages.

4. Special students may be admitted to college without the usual form of examination under the following conditions: (a) They must be of mature age (not less than 20 years is suggested); (b) They must not be admitted to classes for which entrance examinations are required unless they pass such examinations; (c) They must give proof of adequate preparation for the courses sought; (d) Their names must be printed separately in the catalogue.

CRITERIA OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The University of California states that the basis on which its list of accredited institutions is made is the experience of the University with students coming from certain of them, the lists prepared by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and published by the Association of American Universities, the experience of institutions in the Association of American Universities, and the tentative list prepared by the United States Bureau of Education in 1911.

Students presenting the bachelor's degree from any of the accredited institutions may enter the graduate division of the University of California without previous evaluation of their credentials. Admission, however, is without classification with reference to candidacy for an advanced degree.

The American Council on Education

EARLY in April the Association of American Colleges transferred to the American Council on Education the administration of the exchange of scholarships between American higher institutions and French lycées and universities. It will be remembered that the Association of American Colleges has secured scholarships which include board and room as well as tuition for a considerable number of French girls during the past two academic years. At the present time there are one hundred and eighty-two (182) French girls on scholarships of this character in American higher institutions. Last year the French Government as a mark of its appreciation for this service offered twenty scholarships in French lycées to American women. These women were selected by the officers of the Association of American Colleges.

By a vote of the Association the American Council on Education now assumes charge of both undertakings. It will make all future arrangements for the assignment of French girls to American institutions on scholarships including room and subsistence. It will be responsible for the selection of the American young women to be sent abroad on the scholarships offered by the French Government. The Executive Committee of the Council has appointed the following representative committee to have charge of these exchanges: Dean Herman V. Ames, representing the Council's Committee on International Educational Relations and the Association of American Universities; President W. L. Bryan, representing the National Association of State Universities; Dr. S. P. Capen, representing the American Council on Education; Professor J. J. Champenois, representing the French Minister of Public Instruction; Professor J. W. Cunliffe, representing the American University Union in Europe; Dr. S. P. Duggan, representing the Institute of International Education; Miss Mary Finn, representing the National Catholic Welfare Council; Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, representing the Association of Collegiate Alumnae; Dr. Robert L. Kelly, repre-

senting the Association of American Colleges, Professor Margaret E. Maltby, representing the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, and Miss Virginia Newcomb, representing the Institute of International Education. This committee is authorized to add to its membership whenever this may seem desirable.

The French Government has offered for the coming year nineteen scholarships at lycées and three at an école normale. At the time the exchanges were transferred to the American Council on Education the Association of American Colleges had already prepared a circular of information with regard to these scholarships and the method of applying for them. The Council has re-issued this. It is as follows:

SCHOLARSHIPS IN FRENCH LYCÉES AND UNIVERSITIES

The Association of American Colleges has transferred to the American Council on Education the task of administering the exchange of students between French and American higher institutions.

Method of Application

In connection with the announcement already made that the French Government is offering scholarships for the academic year 1920-21 in French lycées and for graduate work, the following method of procedure may be stated.

The applicant should write a letter in her own handwriting to the undersigned, indicating her purpose in applying for this scholarship. The uses to which she expects to put the training provided for by these scholarships in case one is assigned her should be clearly set forth. This letter should give the committee on selection not only the applicant's point of view, but also information concerning her previous training.

At least one letter must be submitted from a well known French teacher indicating that the applicant has made an exceptional record in the study of French. Preference will be given to those who are able to speak French.

A transcript of the applicant's college record duly signed by the proper college official should accompany the application.

A transcript of the applicant's high school record duly signed by the proper high school official should accompany the application.

At least one certificate from a responsible party as to the applicant's personality, adaptability, disposition, etc.

A certificate of character by a pastor or other responsible party.

A health certificate by a physician.

A birth certificate in legal form.

Any other data bearing upon the applicant's candidacy.

It is to be understood that the applicant may be called in for a per-

sonal conference with a member or members of the Committee on Selection.

When the conditions above mentioned have been complied with, the documents should be sent to the Director of the American Council on Education.

SAMUEL P. CAPEN,
Director.

NEW MEMBERS

Since the issuance of the January number of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD, there have been the following additions to the Council's membership:

Associate Members

The Modern Language Association of America;
National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges
and Secondary Schools;
National Institution for Moral Instruction.

Institutional Members

CALIFORNIA:	MICHIGAN:
Occidental College	University of Michigan
ILLINOIS:	MISSOURI:
Northwestern University	Kirksville State Teachers College
IOWA:	MONTANA:
Union College of Iowa	University of Montana
KANSAS:	
Washburn College	

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly by

The American Council on Education

Volume 1

July, 1920

No. 3

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

Report of the Committee on Federal Legislation

By John H. MacCracken

The Smith-Towner Bill

By George D. Strayer

Comments on the Smith-Towner Bill

By Arthur T. Hadley

A Federal Department of Education and Science

By William F. Willoughby

National Problems in Education

By Charles H. Judd

The General Staff Functions of a Federal Education Office

By Charles R. Mann

The Equivalence of French and American Degrees and Certificates

By the Editor

The American Council on Education

By the Editor

Annual Subscription, \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1920
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Report of the Committee on Federal Legislation¹

THE Committee on Federal Legislation is the outgrowth of the special committee appointed at the meeting held in Washington, January 30, 1918, which meeting resulted in the organization of the Emergency Council on Education. The special committee consisted of President Judson, President Campbell and the speaker, and was appointed to urge upon Congress the creation of a National Department of Education. The committee presented a printed statement at that time to Senator Smith in support of the bill introduced by Senator Owen providing for a National Department of Education under the direction of a Secretary who should be also a member of the President's cabinet.

I cannot perhaps do better than to quote part of that statement, which well reflects the attitude of the educational world toward this question in January, 1918. The statement was presented to Senator Smith at a personal interview, at which a number of those in attendance at the meeting of the Council, as well as the members of the special committee, were present:

While leaving to the states all the old measure of autonomy in their own educational systems, it will be necessary to provide some central and general agency through which they may all express themselves in policies which are either national or international in scope. Since education is universally recognized as the first corollary of democracy, it seems incongruous that it should not be recognized as of equal rank in the councils of the nation with that accorded commerce, labor, and agriculture, all of which have representatives in the President's cabinet.

Under the new conditions which the war has produced, the supreme importance of education to the country stands out more clearly than ever before. The great ideals which have always been in the minds of the people more or less in solution, need to be crystallized into definite form, and to become well defined directing motives in the national consciousness. In the absence of a state religion, the educational organization of the country must be the means of placing emphasis on the great moral and spiritual values which are ultimately the determining factors in a nation's history. By the enlightenment which it spreads and the emphasis which it places on the great moral laws, it can prove a large measure of salvation in a shifting social and economic

¹ Report presented at the third annual meeting of the American Council on Education, May 7, 1920.

order which we are inevitably facing at the close of the war. What use will be made of the new measure of leisure which seems to be coming to the workman and what application he will make of the enlarged power which is already his, will largely be determined by the place which is accorded education in the national life. The enlargement of the suffrage also brings weighty additional responsibilities to the schools.

The nation's ideals, consciously expressed in the lives of its people, determine its destiny. As Humbolt has said, "What we desire in the government, we must first put into the minds of the people through the schools."

These are some of the considerations which seem to demand the recognition of education in the largest and most dignified way by the Government. The creation of a Department of Education would in our judgment unify, direct, and stimulate effort, and would give just recognition to the dignity and practical importance of education in the national life. It would also establish a governmental agency for dealing with international educational problems of a rank coordinate with the educational departments of the majority of the great nations with which we shall be dealing.

At a meeting of the Department of Superintendence held in Atlantic City the following month, a committee of eight members appointed by the president of the National Education Association "To represent the N. E. A. in mapping out a program for the rebuilding of civilization by a war modified education" and a committee of seven appointed by the president of the Department of Superintendence, were merged, becoming the Joint Commission of the National Education Association with George D. Strayer as chairman and L. D. Coffman as secretary, for the purpose of studying educational problems during the war. The commission held its first meeting at Atlantic City March 1, and at that time appointed a committee to prepare a bill for a Department of Education and to report back to a meeting of the Joint Commission to be held in Washington on Friday, March 8. Dr. Strayer was appointed chairman of the subcommittee, and President Judson a member of the committee.

At the same time, the Committee of the Emergency Council submitted to the Committee on Resolutions of the Department of Superintendence a resolution endorsing the plan for a Secretary of Education, but after conference with Commissioner Claxton, the Committee on Resolutions decided not to submit to the convention the resolution favoring the creation of the department.

The members of the Special Committee of the Council were present by invitation at the meetings of the Joint Commission held in Washington in March, and participated in the discussion. There was a general unanimity of opinion in favor of a Secretary of Education in preference to a Board of Education. When, however, it was discovered that certain senators would not favor

the creation of the department unless at the same time large funds were placed in the hands of the new department for disbursement, and when the Commission voted in favor of following the precedent of the Smith-Hughes Bill and making large conditional grants of Federal money to education—thus purchasing a Federal participation in education which could not be secured directly under the Constitution and of consolidating various interests which were supporting bills for Americanization, Physical Training, Abolishment of Illiteracy, etc., in support of an omnibus bill carrying an appropriation of \$100,000,000, roughly apportioned among these various objects for expenditure by the states, but providing an appropriation of only \$300,000 for the work of creating leadership by the National Department itself—it was found that the proposal could not secure the unanimous support of higher education.

It was represented to the Commission of the N. E. A. that it was more important that education should be solidly behind whatever measure was proposed, than that the support of various special interests be secured, and that it was not sound political theory to accede to the view of certain senators that the importance of a Department of the National Government must be measured by the amount of money it disburses. Indeed, one function of the National Department of Education would be to save the nation from this materialistic philosophy, which it could never do if it accepted the doctrine as the foundation stone of its own structure.

The Commission was not willing, however, to yield on the matter of the appropriation, and it was agreed that Superintendent Chandler, on behalf of the Commission, and the writer on behalf of the Council, should submit bills embodying the views of the two parties, and Senator Smith be asked to work out from the two bills a compromise measure, which in his judgment could be passed by the Senate. Senator Smith deferred from time to time the drafting of the bill, and finally decided to present to the Senate a bill substantially as drafted by the Commission of the N. E. A. It had been the understanding that the bill of the Commission was incomplete without a section dealing with the interests of higher education, and it was suggested that the Council prepare this section to be offered as an amendment to the bill of Senator Smith. The Council's Committee, however, felt that it could not submit an amendment to Senator Smith's bill without committing itself actively to the support of the 50-50

subsidy principle, and has therefore not submitted the amendment.

It was agreed by the committee that in order to secure the creation of a Department of Education, the committee would not oppose the Smith bill, but that it could not actively support it as a whole. It was willing that the plan should have a fair trial before the Senate and before the educational world in general.

At the public hearing of the bill held in the fall of 1918, Dr. Kelly appeared before the Senate Committee and stated to the committee that the Council favored the bill. In making this statement Dr. Kelly evidently exceeded his authority, as the action was taken without any consultation with the Committee on the National Department and was contrary to the policy on which the committee had determined.

In July, 1918, the committee talked with President Wilson regarding the establishment of a Department of Education, and the President announced himself as unwilling to take up the question during the war. The committee decided, therefore, that it would be hopeless to attempt to introduce a new member into the President's family during the war, and made no further effort to urge legislation along this line. The abrupt termination of the war—the passing of the control of Congress from the Democrats to the Republicans—the obvious necessity for the curtailment of national expenditures, and the desire of the Republican party to make political capital out of Democratic extravagance during the war, made the plan to secure an appropriation of \$100,000,000—which had appeared questionable to many even in the extravagant war days—appear still more questionable when all good citizens were preaching postponement of all expenditure not absolutely vital.

In the meantime, public opinion has quite generally endorsed the budget system for departmental appropriations. It is expected that such a system will be adopted in the near future. As an almost inevitable result, will come a rearrangement of the work of the various executive departments, as provided in the Moore bill drafted by Professor Willoughby. In addition to education, other interests are pressing for recognition in such a reorganization of executive departments, including the engineering interests which ask for a Department of Public Works—the medical interests which ask for a Department of Public Health, etc.

Your Committee holds the same opinion that it held in January, 1918, that education is not adequately represented in the organization of our National Government, and believes that in the re-

organization of the National Government about to take place, we must seek this adequate recognition. We are also of the opinion, however, that if such an educational department is created, its higher intellectual functions must not be submerged by unduly magnified functions of the paymaster type. A Department of Education ought to be more closely akin to the Department of State than to the Department of the Treasury or of the Post Office, and members of the Senate to the contrary notwithstanding, it ought to be able to maintain its dignity and importance as the Department of State maintains its dignity and importance over against the Department of the Treasury, even though its expenditures are only a fraction of the Treasury's expenditures.

I have thought it best to give this brief historical résumé of the work of the Committee on Legislation to clear up, so far as possible, certain misunderstandings which have arisen, and to clear the way for the constructive discussion which we hope may follow.

We have proposed to ourselves, as a committee, the question of how far a committee representing so many diverse organizations as are included in the American Council is free to go in taking a position either in support of or in opposition to any particular measure pending in Congress. It is obvious that the committee can take decisive action only on such matters as command substantial agreement in the educational world, and that it must content itself, in other matters, with serving as a bureau of investigation and information. Following the precedents of the United States Chamber of Commerce and other similar organizations, it can help to crystallize public opinion and learn the views of the educational world for its own guidance through questionnaires. It can also keep the educational world informed of legislation pending in Congress of educational significance, and point out the questions to be considered in connection with such legislation, by educational interests. The first number of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD showed how valuable a service the Council can perform for American education and for Congress itself in this direction. The Committee hopes that before the close of this conference the delegates will make further suggestions as to the method of procedure to be followed by the Committee, and the service which it may helpfully perform.

JOHN H. MACCRACKEN,
Chairman.

The Smith-Towner Bill¹

I TAKE it for granted that everyone present is familiar with the provisions of the Smith-Towner bill, but I come this morning, first of all, to report on a referendum that has already been taken by the public school administrators of the United States.

President MacCracken called your attention to the fact that at a meeting in 1918 at Atlantic City no action was taken. At each and every meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association from that time to this the question of the establishment of a National Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's cabinet and the issue of appropriations by the National Government for the purposes set forth by that bill has been brought to the attention of those who administer public education throughout the nation.

At the last meeting of the Department of Superintendence in Cleveland this measure was vigorously attacked by a very small minority, and there was one of the most spontaneous votes that I have ever seen given on the floor of that convention when the 4,000 superintendents of schools present rose as one man and acclaimed the man who had defended the measure and who had claimed that he did represent the opinion, the refined and developed judgment of those responsible for the administration of public education in the United States.

I am interested in the referendum which this Council intends to undertake, and I hope that it will be perfectly clear after that referendum is taken, and that it will be stated in the first paragraph of the report, that this is a referendum taken primarily by the higher educational institutions and that it does not and cannot represent the judgment of those who are responsible for administering public education in the United States. There are approximately 6,000 state, city and county superintendents of schools, and I take it that in representing them I represent the men who are best able to judge of the needs of this country with respect to public education.

It has been suggested—and I have left myself free this morning

¹ Address delivered at the third annual meeting of the American Council on Education, May 7, 1920.

to speak as I am speaking because the opponents of the bill have so often shifted the ground of their attack that I thought it would be unwise to have a paper prepared ahead of time—it has been suggested in other meetings like this that the difficulty with the Smith-Towner bill is that it has not been subjected to discussion or debate. Might I call your attention to the fact that the first draft of the bill was distributed to 50,000 individuals through the United States at the expense of the National Education Association and that there were literally hundreds of letters sent to the Commission on the Emergency in Education in discussion of the measure. May I as well call your attention to the fact that the meetings of this Commission in the development of the bill in its present form were always open meetings, and that from every part of the United States state superintendents of schools, city superintendents of schools, the presidents of normal colleges and universities did come to the meetings, did debate the issues, and did record their judgment.

I do not stand here to present for your consideration something that a group of people appointed to draft a bill drafted out of their own judgment or thought with respect to the situation. I literally have in the Smith-Towner bill to ask you to consider the judgment, after debate and discussion, of those who do administer public education in the United States. But the debate and discussion has gone beyond our group. I think it is worth while to call your attention to the fact that the bill has been before a great many national bodies, bodies of laymen, and that the following groups in their national conventions or associations assembled have endorsed the measure: The General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Library Association, the American Federation of Labor after debate, after discussion, and after a very serious attempt had been made to have them record on the opposite side, the National Congress of Mothers, the Parent-Teachers Association, the National Council of Jewish Women, the Educational Department of the Inter-Church World Movement, the Associate Committee of the Women's Democratic National Committee, the Associate Committee of the Women's Republican National Committee, the National League of Women Voters, and the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

In addition to those national bodies there have been literally thousands of local groups who have taken action after the case has been presented for their consideration and after the queries

and discussion which always must follow the presentation of a measure of this sort have been satisfied. At a recent sectional meeting of the Rotary Clubs of the Mississippi Valley, with 2,300 delegates present, they voted with but one dissenting vote in favor of the measure and agreed to make it their special order of business for the national convention to be held in Atlantic City.

Let us review the bill now in order to inquire what the objections have been and to answer them if may be, or to concede that they must be subjected to further consideration.

The bill creates a Department of Education. The Council favors the creation of such a department. I am not unaware of the fact that there are those—I thought it was more or less suggested in President MacCracken's paper this morning—who would wait until our National Government has been reformed before establishing this new department of government. I do recognize that there is a distinction in our National Government between those departments which have a truly executive function and those which are created after the manner of the Department of Agriculture, and Labor, or Commerce, for purposes of research or for the purpose of offering leadership in that field.

I do not believe that there is gain to education or any possibility of meeting the present emergency by waiting until Mr. Lowden or somebody else becomes President of the United States and there has been a debate of two or three or some other number of years which shall finally eventuate in a reformed national government. We may get it. I am not altogether sure, even though Mr. Lowden be the President of the United States. So I stand solidly—and I believe that I represent those who are working for the advancement of public education—I stand solidly for the creation of the department now and the reform, if need be, of that department, as of others, when the National Government is reformed.

The question of the constitution of the department has been raised, and properly so. Those of us who debate these issues dogmatically—because the debate is more or less dogmatic when we take to studying a new department—must determine, upon some principle which we feel to be sound, how the department shall be organized. Shall we present a complete plan of organization involving the transfer of many bureaus to the new department or shall we be wiser, as it seems to me the Smith-Towner bill is—very much wiser—in saying we will take what is now the Bureau

of Education, which is the only organization in our National Government which by any stretch of the imagination can be thought of as having to do with more than some highly specialized function of education—shall we take it and say the Bureau of Education is to be the nucleus and the Secretary of Education shall have as his most important duty, possibly, during the first year of his office, the conference with his colleagues of the cabinet, the debate and discussion and the careful inquiry as to what offices shall finally constitute the new department? Such inquiry could not possibly be instituted by any one of us, however wise we might be, or however sincere we might be in desiring to build that organization before the fact of a creation of a department. I do not believe there is a man so wise today that he can announce the principle which will determine just which of those divisions or bureaus or administrative units with functions that are not clear and distinct, but often mixed, should be included in the Department of Education. I do not believe it can be done. It has got to be, I think, a matter that the Secretary works out with his colleagues in the cabinet of the President of the United States.

And then I am just enough of a believer in getting something done to believe that it is a little better not to antagonize all the people who may be powerful, when you seek to do something which may seem to them to limit somewhat their present function. I am more or less acquainted with the desire of every department to keep all that it has and get a little bit more. And, as I say, I am worldly-minded enough to be willing to take into account human nature in order to accomplish the good which may be below.

The bill appropriates money in accordance with the materialistic philosophy of which President MacCracken spoke. I wonder if you are near enough to the crisis in American education, most of you, to know how material the need for money is. I am able to go back and remember the day when certain eminent presidents of universities of the United States objected to funds appropriated to colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, and I am quite sure they were sincere about it, and they thought it very materialistic that anybody should want money for those public institutions.

In the United States today one teacher out of five in the public schools has a high school education and two years of professional training, and four out of five have less than that amount of education. Is it time that we considered seriously a national program

that will not only necessitate investigations but will actually provide funds that shall make it possible for American boys and girls to have trained teachers? That is the issue, and it seems to me that it is perfectly clear. The states will help. The states are spending more money than it is proposed to appropriate, but the states need encouragement.

I think I could make myself clear if I were to say that our National Government during the period of the past decade has taken from the states and from the localities the most remunerative source of revenue and has left them with the most expensive functions of government. The most expensive function of government is education. If it was a sound policy, or if it is today a sound policy, to support higher education as represented by the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, it is certainly as sound a policy to appropriate money to encourage the states to undertake a program which has the result of providing trained teachers for American boys and girls. Oh, I could draw the picture very much darker. I could tell you of the million boys and girls in the United States today who, if they are in school or were in school during this year, were taught by boys and girls who had nothing but the meager elementary school education which was provided in that same miserable institution in which they were teaching. But I do not think that is necessary. You know what the situation is. It cries out for relief, and I believe that the stimulation which will come from such grants of money as the Nation may make will result in good as represented by more training for teachers.

I might have discussed, and I might yet discuss, the basis upon which one might defend appropriations for the removal of illiteracy, for the Americanization of foreigners, for the development of the program of physical education and health service, but I thought possibly it would be better to call attention to that other larger appropriation which seeks to provide a basis for equalizing educational opportunity. I have understood that there is more objection to this appropriation than to any other. I believe that we are a nation, and I subscribe to that principle which has been so often enunciated, that in our democracy we promise equality of opportunity. We promise it, and the corollary of that promise is that there shall be an equality of burden to be borne by those who supply the opportunity by providing the revenues which are to establish and maintain schools. If you grant that, then, in the sit-

uation as it is today in the United States, with an inequality of wealth measured in terms of state boundaries by a ratio of one to six, if one takes the extreme cases, I do not know how we can continue to promise equality and then offhand to deny it by saying we will not appropriate any money that seeks to equalize the opportunity which boys and girls are to enjoy in education. The basis proposed for the distribution of funds, worked out as carefully as it has been worked out by the statisticians employed by the Commission on the Emergency in Education, will make it clear that that part of the country which needs most will get most.

Then there is the further objection—possibly it is the last—to appropriations without control and supervision.

There is no one thing that came out more clearly in the series of referenda which have been taken with respect to this bill than the fact that those responsible for administering public education in the United States do not believe that it is a sound policy to have our National Government control or supervise education. They are pretty good constitutional lawyers when they take that point of view, because you remember it is expressly provided that those functions not given over to Congress or to the National Government are reserved to the states, and education is one of them. But we do not lose sight, and the bill has not lost sight, of the necessity for stimulating the state, and for seeing that the state expends its money for the purpose which the Nation has in mind.

The bill as drawn provides that there shall be a minimum school term of twenty-four weeks. It is pitiful, isn't it? But if you were immediately to raise that number of weeks to the level that you would like to see you would practically deny to the community that most needed help the encouragement that will enable it later on to raise the length of its school term.

It was proposed in a discussion in which I participated last week that money should be appropriated for the training of teachers in terms of the number of teachers who had standard training. That was to be one of the bases. And immediately by the very fact of setting up that criterion you deny to the people who most need encouragement the encouragement which the Nation alone could give.

The bill provides that there shall be compulsory education between seven and fourteen years of age. Why not propose immediately between six and eighteen? Personally I think it would

be unwise. I think if we can have enacted and maintain a standard compulsory education between seven and fourteen through the United States we have made a very great gain.

The bill provides that in order to participate in the funds which are appropriated children throughout the nation, in whatever type of school they attend, shall be taught during the elementary school period in the English tongue. One might propose that there be other standards set that would be uniformly spread over all types of school. Personally I should consider it unwise.

I was amused—I confess it—by the suggestion that the bill had been modified from its original provision which suggested that the Secretary might make rules and regulations which the state would have to follow—that it had been changed from that to its present form because of the insistence of a body of teachers known as the American Federation of Teachers. I have reported the case to you accurately when I say that the bill was changed from its original form to its present form because of the insistence, the almost overwhelming insistence, of men who have had the responsibility of administering education under provisions already enforced by the National Government.

Just a word more. The suggestion has been made, and the referendum which is proposed suggests, that the bill throughout is a fifty-fifty proposition. It is not, and I think we ought to be very clear about that. The bill does provide that the state must appropriate as much money as the Federal Government appropriate, but if you will read another section of the bill you will find that there is the express provision that the sum or sums provided by the state for the equalization of educational opportunities, for the promotion of physical education, for the preparation of teachers, shall not be less for any year than the amount provided for the same purpose for the fiscal year next preceding the acceptance of the provisions of this act. The only virtue or meaning that has is that we know already, without waiting, that the states are spending vastly more than the appropriation which would come from the National Government, and it was simply to guard against any possibility that the state would withdraw funds in order to avail itself of national support. We do know that the appropriation is only fifty-fifty for those parts of the enterprise which are new, like the removal of illiteracy, or which are not being looked after well at the present time—the Americanization of foreigners, for example

—and in no case is it anticipated that the Federal appropriation would equal the amount spent by the state once the program was well established.

I might just call your attention to the fact that the colleges of agriculture throughout the United States today are spending anywhere from two to three up to ten and twenty times the amount of money the National Government gives them. It was the conception underlying this bill that the same ratio of state to Federal expenditures would immediately prevail in some of the enterprises for which aid and encouragement is given in the Smith-Towner bill and eventually would prevail in every enterprise.

May I in closing read a part of the resolution which was drawn by the Department of Superintendence at Cleveland and adopted by that body:

We reaffirm our endorsement of the Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's cabinet and of national appropriations in aid and encouragement of education in the nation, with the express provision that Federal aid shall not imply Federal control or supervision of education and that education in all of its phases shall be organized, supervised and administered exclusively by state and local educational authorities established by state laws as provided in the Smith-Towner bill now pending in Congress.

There is one amendment which has been proposed and which has been put in form by the Field Secretary of the National Education Association which I should heartily endorse. It reads as follows:

That there shall be an advisory council in the Department of Education which shall be known as the National Council of Education. The Council shall consist of not to exceed one hundred members and shall be constituted as follows:

First, The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Commissioner of Education, or other legally constituted chief educational authority of each state and territory.

Second, Prominent educators not exceeding twenty-five in number representing organizations or institutions and different phases of educational activity both public and private, to be appointed by the Secretary of Education.

Third, Men and women not educators, to be appointed by the Secretary of Education, equal in number to those appointed under two above, representing the public and the relation of education to the different phases of our national life.

The National Council of Education shall meet at least once a year at the call of the Secretary of Education and shall consider the work of the Department of Education and make recommendations thereon to the Secretary.

Members of the Council shall serve without pay, but expenses incurred

in attending meetings of the Council shall be paid out of the appropriations made to the department for traveling expenses.

That reminds me of one issue which has been raised which I have not covered, that of the amount of the appropriation granted to the newly organized department for its researches and for the administration of the department. The bill carries an appropriation of \$500,000. To that will immediately be added the \$200,000 available from the Bureau of Education, exclusive of its work in Alaska, making a total of \$700,000 available for the administration.

I think I know something about what would be required by the audit that the bill provides should be had in order to know that money had been spent by the states for the purpose for which it was appropriated. I would estimate an outside figure of \$50,000 would take care of such an audit. That would leave \$650,000 for the actual investigation and research work of the department. I think I could spend more money; I think you could spend more money. I think many people would like to have a larger fund available. But I think it would be a fairly respectable appropriation for a young department, yet to be developed and organized, to begin with.

I have just one plea, if it may be so characterized, and that is that this body, representing as it does primarily higher education in the United States, consider seriously the thought and the judgment expressed several times in the past two years by the men and women who are administering public education, that if possible we who work in those higher educational institutions align ourselves with them for the encouragement and development of that public school system rather than with the enemies of public education.

GEORGE D. STRAYER.

Comments on the Smith-Towner Bill

YALE UNIVERSITY
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

April 7, 1920.

MY DEAR MR. CAPEN:

I am very glad indeed to get your letter and the enclosures. The copy of the EDUCATIONAL RECORD for January, 1920, is particularly valuable. I have been so busy that I could hardly keep up with current periodical literature, and did not know that the various things which we want were so clearly and successfully connected under one cover.

Personally I hope that the Smith-Towner bill will not pass, for the following reasons:

1. The concentration of educational supervision in a national capital has always worked badly, and there is no reason to suppose that the United States would prove an exception to this general rule. French education when controlled from Paris has tended to ossify, and only as they have given independence to different districts and different parts of the system has there been any progress made. All the great pieces of progress of the last century were done in opposition to the national incubus of a centralized bureau. In Germany the case was even worse. When I was in Berlin during the winter of 1907-08 I saw a good deal of the inside working; and the degradation of German thought was largely due to the fact that through the establishment, first of Berlin University and second of other centralized Prussian authorities, the politicians had become able to throttle free thought. I regard the Smith-Towner bill as a long step in the Prussianizing of American education.

2. I regard the introduction of another cabinet minister as calculated to weaken rather than strengthen the influence of the Cabinet. In the old days, when our Cabinet consisted of heads of government departments of the first rank, cabinet councils meant a great deal, because the Cabinet consisted of men who knew how to govern. The introduction of departments of Agriculture and of Labor, however good in themselves, weakened the force of the cabinet council, because men were appointed for other reasons

than their training in the science of government. If we compare the cabinets of the day with those of twenty or of fifty years ago, I think we all will see the difference in this respect; and I think that most people will regard the change as a change for the worse.

3. Finally, I regard the present as a singularly inopportune time for anything that involves increased national expense at Washington, because everything of this sort tends to increase the high cost of living. There is not time for going into the detail of the economic analysis; but every hundred million of money spent by the Federal Government under present tax or loan conditions is mostly taken out of capital and mostly added to personal expenditure. The addition to personal expenditure means an increased money demand for products. The diminished capital means a diminished supply of means of production. Thus the price disturbance, already bad enough, is accentuated at both ends. I am inclined to think that the bad effect of the proposed bill taken by itself, in putting up prices of goods beyond their present high figure, would be greater than anything that it would do for teachers' salaries; and if this bill is not taken by itself, but regarded as part of a movement for getting national money for local distribution in a great many directions, the adverse effect is going to be many times bigger than any possible good.

This last point is of the greatest immediate practical moment. If the advocates of the various education bills and soldiers' bounty bills and public health bills get any considerable portion of their measures passed, I anticipate economic disturbances in the immediate future which will be far greater in disastrous effect than the terrible crisis of 1873-78 which some of us are just old enough to remember.

You may use the whole of this letter, or any part of it, in any way that you think proper. I only regret that I cannot be present in person at the Council meeting to answer questions about it.

Very sincerely,

ARTHUR T. HADLEY,
President.

Dr. S. P. Capen,
American Council on Education,
818 Connecticut Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

A Federal Department of Education and Science¹

I WILL ask your indulgence that I be permitted to speak from some rather brief notes rather than to attempt anything like a formal address. To start at once on my subject, the first point that I would like to make is that the proposition for the creation of a Department of Education and Science is one that cannot, or should not, be considered by itself. It should be considered as part of a general proposition to reorganize the administrative branch of the Government.

As you probably know, the administrative branch of the National Government with its one hundred or more distinct services has grown up like a rambling set of buildings on an estate; additions and sheds and outlying structures have been added from time to time, each one in response to some particular demand but without reference to any carefully thought out plan. The result is that we have, at the present time, several scores of services that, in a very rough way, are classified by departments, but to a very great extent are not properly classified, with a result that services are not located where they should be. There is overlapping, duplication of organization, plant, and activities on a wide scale.

For example, Secretary Redfield told me some months ago—probably a year or two ago—that when the Tariff Commission, I think it was, was created it sent a man to South America in order to study the tariff systems of those countries, utterly ignorant of the fact that in one of the services of his department, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, there was a Division of Foreign Tariffs whose duty it was to make exactly that sort of studies and which, in fact, had a man in South America at that identical time on that work.

I give that as an illustration of the sort of thing that takes place in our Government at the present time, and will continue to take place until the services that have to do with the same

¹ Address delivered at the Third Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education, May 7, 1920.

field of activities, and that ought to have close working relations with each other, are brought together under some common direction.

Now a great many of the arguments that can be brought forward in favor of bringing together the educational and scientific services of the Government, can be made with equal force in regard to bringing together other services, such as those pertaining to the public health, public works or maritime affairs, whose operations fall in the same general field. I am going to start off, therefore, by trying to state some of the arguments, from the purely practical standpoint of securing a more efficient and economical government, that would result from the creation of a Department of Education and Science or the creation of any other department that would bring together under a common head services working in the same general field. I am doing this since, unless we can establish the advantages that are going to accrue to the Government in distinction from those that will be conferred upon the persons outside of the Government who are interested in a particular activity, the chances of success in securing the action sought are not great.

One of the first advantages of bringing together like services is in securing a simpler government. Our National Government is now on such a vast scale that it is very difficult for the general public to get any comprehensive conception of its activities or of the particular services performing them. It is likewise a matter of no little difficulty for Congress itself to secure this information and properly to perform its function of legislating and appropriating for the government. Any action that will simplify the Government will thus facilitate the practical operation and the use of its services by the general public. Secondly, a proper coordination of the administrative services will help very much in what is called overhead administration. It is perfectly evident that when a secretary of a department, like the Secretary of the Treasury, for example, has to concern himself, not merely with finance but with public health, public buildings, war risk insurance and a number of other matters that do not relate directly to his financial responsibilities, he cannot perform his duties as general administrator as effectively as he could had he to concern himself with only a single class of closely related duties.

Thirdly, the bringing together of related services makes possible the realization of great economies and the securing of

greater efficiency in the performance of what may be called the technical business or housekeeping duties of government. If the activities of government services are analyzed it will be found that they fall into two classes: those concerned with running the services as institutions; that is, conducting correspondence, handling supplies, keeping accounts, rendering reports, etc., that have to be done in order that the services may exist and operate; and those that have to do with performance of the work for which the institution exists. Now economy and efficiency are to be secured primarily in respect of the first class; that is, the purely business, housekeeping duties of running the services. If all the services under a common head are working in the same field and have the same general character of problems, all of those business activities can be performed with far greater efficiency. The chief clerk, the disbursing officer, the chief of the division of supplies, etc., are all dealing with the same set of problems; one officer can frequently perform the duties for all the services; and uniformity or standardization of methods can be secured. This is difficult, if not impossible, when the services under a department are of a diverse character.

Fourthly, a far more effective utilization of plant; such as libraries, blue-print rooms, laboratories, and of facilities generally, can be secured if services working in the same field can be brought together under a common direction, and better still, under a single roof. In many cases it will be found feasible to make use of a single well-equipped library, laboratory or blue-print room in place of a number of less well equipped, but, in the aggregate, more expensive plants.

Finally, a systematic grouping of administrative services makes possible the formulation of general work programs that cannot be framed when services are scattered among the different departments according to no logical plan. This phase of the problem is one in which I am especially interested at the present time.

There is now pending in a conference committee a bill that has passed both the Senate and the House providing for the adoption of a national budget system. If that system is to work well, the President will have to come before the Congress each year with a definite program of what he thinks the Government should do. He must have his educational program, his public works program, his public health program, etc. It is going to be exceedingly

difficult for him to prepare such programs unless he himself can look to a single responsible officer for recommendations in respect to what should be done in each field.

In the foregoing I have sought to do two things: (1) to show the desirability of a proper grouping of services departmentally from the purely government standpoint; (2) to emphasize the fact that this problem is one that should be considered from the viewpoint of a regrouping of all the services of the government in accordance with some general plan rather than from that of a particular class of services. In justification of the latter contention I wish to refer to a measure now pending before Congress, known as the Jones-Reavis bill, which provides for the creation of a Department of Public Works. This bill, which is brought forward and urged by the engineering interests of the country, provides for the creation of such a department by transforming the present Department of the Interior into such a department. To accomplish this, the bill provides for the transfer of the non-engineering services of the Department of the Interior to other departments. Under it the Bureau of Education goes to the Department of Labor. It calls for the attachment to the proposed Department of Public Works of the Bureau of Standards, though, as will shortly be pointed out, this service should logically go to the Department of Education and Science, the establishment of which, in the opinion of many, is highly desirable. Now the engineers when they formulated their proposals were no more interested in the other services of the government, the non-engineering services, than the War Department is in the condition of the National Treasury. They simply considered their own proposition.

That is the sort of conflict that is bound to arise whenever a proposition for the creation of a single new department is brought forward. Two propositions are now pending in Congress providing for the creation of a joint committee of the two houses of Congress to consider the whole question of the regrouping departmentally of the several services of the government. These are the Smoot Resolution in the Senate and the Moore Resolution in the House. It is submitted that this is the proper method of considering the various proposals now being urged for the creation of new departments. Each interest should be carefully formulating its wishes in order that, when such an inquiry is entered upon, it can appear before the committee or commission having it in charge and make known what provision

in the way of a new department to serve its interests should be made. I, furthermore, believe that, strategically, this is the most effective plan of campaign, as I believe that success is more likely through following this method than by each interest individually seeking to have created a department to serve it.

Looking upon what I have said up to this point in the nature of a general introduction, I wish now to pass to the specific proposition that I desire to bring before this meeting as one that should receive careful consideration by all those who are interested in the function of the National Government in respect to the promotion and prosecution of educational and scientific research. I refer to the bringing together in a single department, to be known as the Department of Education and Science, of all of the services of the Government, now scattered among the existing departments having as their primary function the prosecution of research studies in the field of education and science.

Investigation shows that the National Government is now maintaining the following services of this character:

1. The Bureau of Education.
2. The Federal Board for Vocational Education.
3. The Library of Congress.
4. The Bureau of Standards.
5. The United States Naval Observatory.
6. The Smithsonian Institution with its subordinate agencies:
 - (a) United States National Museum.
 - (b) Astrophysical Observatory.
 - (c) Bureau of American Ethnology.
 - (d) Regional Bureau for the United States, International Catalogue of Scientific Literature.
 - (e) International Exchanges.
 - (f) The National Zoological Park.
7. The Bureau of the Census.
8. National Botanic Gardens.
9. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
10. The Commission on Fine Arts.
11. The United States Geographic Board.

In addition to the foregoing there are a number of other official or semi-official bodies the bringing of which under the jurisdiction of a Department of Education and Science, if such a department is created, should receive careful consideration. Among them may be mentioned:

1. The International Bureau of Weights and Measures.
2. The International Seismological Association.
3. The International Geodetic Association for Measurement of the Earth.
4. The International Latitude Observatory, Ukiah, California.
5. The International Commission on Annual Tables of Constants and other international organizations now under the general jurisdiction of the Department of State.
6. The National Academy of Sciences with its subordinate agency the National Research Council.
7. The American Historical Association which reports to and whose annual report is published by the National Government.

Now you will note that in reading that list I made no mention of a large number of services of the Government that are engaged in scientific work; for example, the scientific bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, the United States Geological Survey, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Mines, and the like. The reason I did not mention those is because I think it would be a very great mistake to consider covering them under a Department of Education and Science, and for this reason: If you examine the work of the services that I have enumerated you will find that they all have this in common, that their prime function is the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge among mankind, and that they have no function of administering a body of substantive law. They are thus in no case parts of the governmental machinery for the administration of any body of law, like the Land Office, which has to administer the land laws, the Patent Office the patent laws, and the like. They are research institutions, pure and simple.

This distinguishing characteristic is one of fundamental importance. There was a proposal made a number of years ago for the creation of a Department of Science based on the idea of having this department do all of the scientific work of the Government. It was proposed, for example, that a single bureau of chemistry in this department should do all the chemical work required by any service of the Government. Such a proposal is unworkable in practice. The scientific research work that has to be done by a service as an incidental feature of its primary duties must be done by the service itself or at least under its immediate direction. I am told, for example, that in the Department of Agriculture great difficulty is encountered in the several services

of that one department making common use of the Bureau of Chemistry that exists in that department. Each one of the bureaus, like the Bureau of Soils, the Bureau of Animal Industry, etc., wants to have its own Division of Chemistry. These bureaus say they cannot make effective use of a service that is not an essential part of their own administrative machines. Any idea of a Department of Education and Research that would seek to dip into every department and service of the Government and take over the scientific work which has to be done by those services in performing their prime functions is thus wholly impossible. I mention this point especially since a great deal has been urged along this line, and I think it has done more to defeat the proposition for a Department of Education and Science than any one thing.

In taking this position it is important to note, however, that there is no reason why, if a Department of Education and Science is created to consist of those services that I have mentioned, that Department should not act as a contracting agency for the Government as a whole. Presumably it would be better equipped as regards personnel and plant than any of the other services in the purely administrative services of the Government. Consequently, it would be quite possible when a scientific problem comes up in the Department of Agriculture, the Geological Survey, or where not, for them to call on the Department of Science and Education to do that work for them. If a Department of Education and Science as here proposed to consist only of those services whose primary function is that of research is created, it is certain that more and more the purely administrative services will make use of its superior facilities to do particular jobs. The department will thus become a general scientific contracting agency for the assistance of such services.

The next point that I would like to consider is that feature of the proposal which calls for the union of education and science in the same department. Now really what is meant by science, as the term is here used, is scientific research, and the function of the National Government, as I view it, in respect of education is almost wholly that of educational research. The National Government does not have responsibility for administering an educational system and probably should not have. Its prime function in this field is that of making those researches into the problems of education and of assembling and making known those

facts and principles that will enable the state and local governments that do have the administration of educational systems better to perform their duties. In further support of this mention may be made of the extent to which these two subjects are handled in our universities. We think of the university usually as an institution to impart instruction. Actually it performs two functions, that of instruction and that of research. We know that when a proposal to appoint a professor comes up weight is given to both of these points, the ability of the candidate under consideration as an instructor and his ability to make scientific research. Education and research are thus closely joined in our educational institutions.

Again there is the practical consideration that the purely educational services of the National Government are not on a sufficient scale to warrant a department. For that reason, if for no other, it would be necessary to unite them. The two together, however, furnish an ample number of services to warrant the setting up of an independent department.

The advantages that would accrue to education and science generally from this bringing together of research agencies are so obvious that I hardly feel it necessary to dwell upon them. A point that might be of interest is the bearing that it would have on the proposal that has been made for a national university. There again I think that the proposal in the form in which it first originated was rather unfortunate. The emphasis was laid upon bringing into existence a national institution to impart instruction. The effort should have been made to bring into existence a national institution of research. A Department of Education and Science would furnish such an institution. Its resources would be available to all students and particularly those in our universities in a way that is not possible under existing conditions. Plans could be worked out by which professors and advanced students desiring to make research studies, could make use of the facilities of the department and cooperate in the work. In like manner use might be made of the personnel and facilities of the universities for work in respect to which they had special competence.

Some of you may not know that in 1892 there was passed a joint resolution which is still on the statute books looking to this particular end. That resolution read:

Whereas, large collections illustrative of the various arts and sciences and

facilitating literary and scientific research have been accumulated by the action of Congress through a series of years at the national capital; and

Whereas, it was the original purpose of the Government thereby to promote research and the diffusion of knowledge, and is now the settled policy and present practice of those charged with the care of these collections specially to encourage students who devote their time to the investigation and study of any branch of knowledge by allowing to them all proper use thereof; and

Whereas, it is represented that the enumeration of these facilities and the formal statement of this policy will encourage the establishment and endowment of institutions of learning at the seat of government, and promote the work of education by attracting students to avail themselves of the advantages aforesaid under the direction of competent instructors: Therefore, be it

Resolved That the facilities for research and illustration in the following and any other governmental collections now existing or hereafter to be established in the city of Washington for the promotion of knowledge shall be accessible, under such rules and restrictions as the officers in charge of each collection may prescribe, subject to such authority as is now or may hereafter be permitted by law, to the scientific investigators and to students of any institution of higher education now incorporated or hereafter to be incorporated under the laws of Congress or of the District of Columbia.

The provision was later strengthened by a subsequent paragraph making it still clearer that Congress looked with favor upon effective use being made of these institutions by the universities and students of the land.

In this connection I wish to quote some testimony given by Major John W. Powell, then the head of the U. S. Geological Survey, in 1885 when a proposal looking to a better coordination of the scientific work of the Government was being investigated by a joint committee of the two houses of Congress.

It will thus be seen that the official organizations of these institutions should be coordinated that they may work together and aid each other and, further, as each is interested to a greater or less extent in the operations of the others, the organization should be such that one shall not be compelled to do that which is the proper function of another, and that no one shall be permitted to encroach upon the functions of another.

As long as the several scientific commissions and bureaus of the general Government are distributed all through the departments of the Government, one in the War Department, another in the Navy, another in the Interior, another in the Treasury, etc., each bureau must necessarily to a large extent be autonomous. They must be self governed, for it is a practical impossibility for any secretary of a general department to make such studies as to scientific research as would warrant him in attempting their control. Hence these institutions have in the past been to a great degree autonomous and must under the same plan, continue to be.

If the statements thus briefly made are correct, it follows that the first guiding principle of the proper official organization of the scientific work of the Government is as follows:

"The scientific institutions of the Government should be placed under one general management."

Testimony such as this, coming from a man who in his time probably knew the scientific problems of government and what the Government was doing as thoroughly as anybody, is very valuable. In another place in his testimony he quoted from a report of a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences that had also inquired into the subject, in which the same position was taken. The quotation read:

Your committee states only the general sentiment and wish of men of science when it says that its members believe that the time is near when the country will demand the institution of a branch of the executive government devoted especially to the direction and control of all the purely scientific work of the Government.

We recently had established, during the war, the National Research Council as an agency of the National Academy of Sciences, and you are undoubtedly aware that that body will in all probability be one of the most important scientific bodies in the United States. While it is a private organization, being an agency of the National Academy of Sciences, its function, as I have had it explained to me, will be to try to prepare a plan of research in all branches of science for the United States. A very ambitious program. It has to do for scientific research generally what a Department of Education and Science should do for the Government. The two would admirably supplement each other. The Department of Education and Science could get the advice of the National Research Council as to the character of inquiries most needed by the scientific world and that most properly should be undertaken by the Government. We would not have the case, which now so frequently occurs, of public and private institutions working in ignorance of what the other is doing.

A final word. When we entered the war it immediately became apparent that it was desirable to mobilize scientific research for the effective prosecution of the war, and the National Research Council was organized largely for that purpose. Imagine the situation if we had had at that time a Department of Education and Scientific Research. We would have entered the war with our scientific plant, personnel and agencies already fully mobilized. We would have known exactly what facilities existed and exactly what personnel was available. These facilities could have been readily expanded by taking on additional help, and the many

scientific problems that the war gave rise to could have been immediately attacked in a way that was impossible under existing conditions where the scientific facilities of the Government were widely scattered. Though the war is now over, the need for a greater concentration and coordination of scientific research effort is still evident. In its essence the creation of a Department of Education and Science means the mobilization of the scientific research agencies of the Government that shall be available, not only in times of peace, but in case we should ever again be so unfortunate as to be forced into world contest that will measurably tax our resources.

WM. F. WILLOUGHBY.

National Problems in Education¹

BY way of general introduction to this paper I beg leave to say that I am heartily in sympathy with any proposal which will give to this country a strong national educational agency. I believe further that such a strong agency can be constituted only after a discriminating consideration of the question: What are the educational problems of truly national character? I am persuaded that up to this time there has been no clear decision on what belongs to the Nation as distinguished from what belongs to the smaller communities. I must accordingly introduce such positive recommendations as I have to make by some description of the movement which is now expressed in the Smith-Towner bill. I believe this bill is in many quarters very popular, but I believe also that it suffers from cardinal defects which can be described as arising out of its lack of discrimination between difficulties which exist throughout the Nation and difficulties which it is the business of the Nation to solve.

The popular mind seems prone to accept the assumption that the Federal Government can with propriety undertake everything and anything. The most insidious form of this popular superstition is the widespread belief that the Federal Government has unlimited financial resources upon which it is entirely legitimate to draw for any worthy enterprise which is otherwise likely to become insolvent.

During the war this general attitude was encouraged and reached a most extravagant form. We were all drilled in unlimited regard for national concerns. Local projects of a social, economic, and even political type were unquestioningly abandoned or subordinated to Federal control. In almost equal degree we became accustomed to relying on the strength of the National Government to overcome all kinds of difficulties. Federal agents took in charge our food and fuel and dictated priorities on every side. For the time being all limitations on Federal control and Federal support were forgotten.

It was during the war period that the movement for a Federal

¹ Address delivered at the third annual meeting of the American Council on Education, May 7, 1920.

Department of Education crystallized into the form in which it has exhibited itself for the last two years. As a result the movement is essentially an emergency movement. The Smith-Towner bill now before Congress bears many clear marks of its origin in war times. The bill opens with a provision that the department shall be made up by the President, so far as its absorption of present Federal bureaus is concerned. Educational leaders, dealing with the problem under the stress of war conditions and prompted by the hope that the bill might pass quickly in its war-time form, abandoned the effort to determine what should be included in the department and adopted the formula of the Overman law which is one of the most sweeping pieces of war legislation that Congress ever enacted.

In the same spirit the bill reaches into the Federal treasury for funds. It is not at all clear that the exact amounts asked for are well considered. Indeed, it is frankly admitted that all the appropriations are mere guesses. Nor is it clear that the plans for expending these funds are matured. There is a kind of breathless haste to get funds and let the future justify, as best it may, what has been done. There is none of the discriminating balance and adjustment of funds to real national needs which the country has a right to expect of its educational leaders.

There were some of us who thought, even in war times, that the bill for a Federal department could have been more wisely formulated than it was, but opposition was pushed aside at that time, and we were told that the bill was the best that could be agreed to by all parties. We were also told that if the educators of the country refrained from criticism the bill could be passed quickly. We were told that the difficulties could all be ironed out after action had been taken.

Whatever the justification for the original form of the bill at the time it was drawn, there is absolutely no justification for what is going on now. The bill did not pass quickly; indeed it has never been reported out of committee. Viewed as a proposal for the long future, it is seen to be repeatedly guilty of the fallacy of ordinary thinking which assumes that every difficulty in the Nation may be unloaded on the shoulders of the Federal Government. It is a striking fact that this assumption is more readily accepted with regard to Federal duties than with regard to Federal rights. The reader of the bill is impressed by the caution which now expresses itself throughout the amended bill—a caution

which puts the most drastic limitations on Federal supervision. The bill, in the form which it has taken on since the war closed, is frankly opposed to letting the Federal Government exercise authority. It acknowledges that the states have not been able to deal with their school problems, but it entrusts all matters of policy, it entrusts not only administration of education but standardization of education as well, to the states, while drawing liberally on the Federal treasury. In short, the bill is little more than an educational relief bill. It is much weaker as a result of the amendments which have been made than it was when drafted in war times. It is fair to describe the present draft as a collection of unhappy compromises.

The original draft of the bill provided for complete Federal supervision of the expenditure of Federal funds. The Secretary of Education had vast and even arbitrary powers of making and approving plans. After the bill had been introduced in its first form the commission which drafted it found that there was widespread opposition to the supervision which it authorized. Instead of redrafting the provision and creating, as might have been done, a type of regulated supervision which would have been defensible against the charges made in opposition to the first bill, the members of the commission turned squarely around, repudiated supervision, and even went to the opposite extreme of explicitly denying to the secretary all power to make and approve plans for educational organization. The clause of the present bill which deals with this matter is as follows:

And provided further, That all the educational facilities encouraged by the provisions of this Act and accepted by a State shall be organized, supervised, and administered exclusively by the legally constituted State and local educational authorities of said State, and the Secretary of Education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto except as herein provided to insure that all funds apportioned to said State shall be used for the purposes for which they are appropriated, and in accordance with the provisions of this Act accepted by said State."

This provision is the exact reverse of that which was contained in the original bill. There it was provided that—

The Secretary of Education is authorized to frame rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this Act, and is furthermore authorized to prescribe a plan of keeping accounts of educational expenditures for use in the several States in so far as such expenditures relate to the provisions of this act. . . .

Or, as the matter is put in another section of the original bill:

That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations made in Sections 11 and 17 of this Act and of all or any of the apportionments made in Sections 12, 13, 14, 15, or 16 of this Act, the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, or other chief State educational authority which may be duly designated to cooperate with the Department of Education, as provided in Section 18 of this Act, shall present to the Secretary of Education plans and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this Act in said States, which plans shall be approved by the said Secretary of Education before any allotment or apportionment of funds is made to said State. The plans of the said State Board of Education, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, or other chief State educational authority designated to cooperate with the Department of Education shall specifically show courses of study and the standards for teacher training preparation to be maintained. When said plans are approved, the said Secretary of Education shall apportion to the said State such fund or funds as said State may be entitled to under this Act.

Neither the absence of all supervision nor the arbitrary powers conferred in the first bill represent careful discrimination. There is a type of supervision that concerns itself with standards; this is indispensable and should have been worked out and written into the bill instead of the present explicitly negative formulae.

A second complete surrender of which the commission is guilty came in the matter of payments to church schools. The first bill provided that not a cent was to be given to church schools. The published records of the commission do not show who was heard from in this matter, but the present bill is wholly innocent of any pronouncement on church schools. The present bill still contains the clause prohibiting the expenditure of Federal funds for buildings, but it puts no limit on expenditure for schools under private control.

The third surrender of the commission was the price paid for the support of the American Federation of Labor. The original bill states with emphasis that \$50,000,000 is to be paid for the improvement and equalization of education in the various states. The present bill has, at the head of the list of items for which this large sum is to be spent, a specific item. That item was inserted, as reported by Mr. Stillman, president of the American Federation of Teachers, under conditions which he describes in the following terms:

On the evening of January 10, 1919, the National Popular Government League arranged an educational program as part of their reconstruction conference. Upon that program Mr. Hugh Magill, who had been made field

secretary of the N. E. A. a few days before, represented the N. E. A., and I represented the A. F. of T. At that meeting Mr. Magill asked me if we couldn't get together on a Federal legislative program. Mr. Lampson and I held several conferences with Mr. Magill and other N. E. A. officials during the following three days. Our first demand as a prerequisite for the support of the American Federation of Teachers, and through us the support of the American Federation of Labor, was the inclusion in the language of the bill of "partial payment of teachers' salaries." Mr. Magill acceded to that gladly.

One might go on describing other sections in which the Smith-Towner bill has sacrificed policy to supposed expediency. Indeed, the advocates of the bill are very frank in saying that the appropriation part of the bill is in no small measure a device for passing the bill. The appropriation section, they tell us, is the part which is acceptable to congressmen; the department can never be created without this bait.

I heard President Eliot sum up a discussion of the Smith-Towner bill a week ago by saying that no one has thought through the problem of organizing a national school system for America. He said that certainly the N. E. A. has not done it, and that neither of the bills which it has presented to Congress can be regarded as satisfactory.

I venture the hope that the American Council on Education will undertake the study of national educational problems *de novo* in order that there may be presented to Congress a clear and coherent national policy.

In the formulation of such a policy we can learn much from the progress which has been made in this country's history in evolving from local community control where we began, to centralized organization of various types. Our state departments of education are examples of American development in the direction of central policies. We have had a number of voluntary associations of institutions and a number of privately endowed foundations of broad scope, reaching in some cases the whole nation. We have also acquired a vast body of experience regarding the operation of Federal agencies for the promotion of national welfare in various lines.

If the American Council on Education will undertake the task of organizing all this experience as the basis for a broad national educational policy, I believe it will do a great service and it will escape the mistakes which have been made by the framers of the Smith-Towner bill.

I cannot in the time at my disposal do more than briefly illus-

trate what I mean by the study of the various types of experience which I have mentioned.

One of the most striking examples of effective management of a national educational problem is that supplied by the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association. I refer to the classification of medical schools by this council. Without legal authority of any kind, the council transformed medical education in America. The classification which it made and enforced was based on such sound objective grounds that it was irresistible. This classification was strong because it grew out of careful study and intelligent insight and was backed up by adequate publicity.

A similar example can be found in the success of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This association began as a purely advisory body. It had no sanction from the states or the National Government. It had no promises from its constituent members that they would accept its standards; but it set up a system of approval of secondary schools and colleges which has become one of the most effective standardizing devices which the educational profession of this country knows. The strength of this association is in the objective character of its standards and in its constant publicity.

Turning to a study of state departments of education, we find that there has been a steady increase in the powers and influence of these departments. At first, the local communities had all the authority in the government of schools. The only functions of the state department were those of compelling the community to keep school and advising in the direction of desirable improvements. Gradually the state enforced the improvement of buildings, compelled children to attend school, took over the certification of teachers, and established normal schools. Later the states began to exercise the power of managing the adoption of textbooks. The problems of higher education were taken up, both at the level of the secondary school and also at the level of the state university.

The states have also dealt with matters of financial support of schools. Grants have been made on a great variety of different bases and for many different purposes. One of the strongest motives for state participation in the management of school finance grows out of the recognition of the necessity of drawing revenue from larger units of taxation in order to equalize educational opportunity in the various parts of the state.

The successes and failures of the various efforts which are referred to in this brief summary of state educational activities ought to be carefully analyzed. Such an analysis would serve as a most useful guide in determining the steps by which the further evolution of centralization into a national form may properly go on.

Speaking quite dogmatically, it may be asserted that states have been fairly successful in dealing with such obvious and tangible matters as attendance, buildings, and certification of teachers. On the other hand, states have not been altogether successful in training teachers, in selecting text-books, in determining the contents of the curriculum, in organizing higher education, or in supporting research.

To this summary of experience in this country may be added a word about what has been done in Europe. This will bring out the sharp contrast between our systems and those across the Atlantic. Europe has succeeded far beyond the United States in setting up high standards for the training of teachers. Europe has absolute control, through central authority, of the curriculum and of such text-books as are used. Europe succeeded long before we did in organizing higher education and fostering research. In other words, European organization does not wait for popular assent; it takes charge of the subtler as well as of the obvious phases of educational organization by virtue of the paternalistic authority which the government exercises over all aspects of the people's life. It is fair to infer from the example of Europe that some day we shall recognize education as an essential part of national life and that we shall deal, through our state departments of education and through a national department, with the subtler phases of education as well as with the obvious and tangible. The contrast will, however, persist. Europe comes at once to the full control of educational organization through authority arbitrarily assumed while we are taking the longer road of developing objective standards and cultivating popular intelligence to understand these standards.

The conclusion toward which this argument has been tending can be reinforced, I believe, by reference to the procedure of two Federal agencies now in existence which have had to do with American education.

The Federal Board for Vocational Education came into existence under circumstances which justify the statement that the American people had no real knowledge of its purposes. The

board proceeded to adopt plans of highly dictatorial type and to put them into operation with the aid of Federal grants. I shall not venture to express a personal judgment as to the success of the work of this board. I shall record, however, the fact that a great many of the school officers of this country are of the opinion that the regulations of the board will have to be seriously modified or the board will have to be abolished. The rules of the board are such that it is not possible to use all of the Federal appropriation, and such portions of the appropriation as are accepted by school systems are believed to be less productive than they might be if they were more wisely administered.

I cite these facts because I believe they show that Federal funds are not at all sure to solve our educational problems. Wisely directed supervision is quite as essential. The judgments of the Federal Board have not been acceptable to the states and we have no truly national policy of vocational education.

One can imagine a European system of vocational education put into operation by governmental fiat and governmental subsidy, but the Federal Board for Vocational Education has demonstrated very impressively that American schools do not take on vocational education by fiat or as a result of subsidy.

The other American Federal agency which I have in mind as throwing light on the methods of dealing with American schools is the Department of Agriculture. There can be no question that the Department of Agriculture has chosen a method of procedure better than that of the vocational board. This department began by developing its scientific investigations and by sending out into the schools supervisors who could report back as well as carry to the schools carefully prepared material. The influence of the Department of Agriculture has grown steadily, and the country has developed its notions about agricultural education under the guidance of a department that has been sympathetically supervisory.

With examples of this type in mind I believe it will be possible for such a body as the American Council on Education to outline a national policy. Our policy must be one of centralization by the gradual process of reference upward of our broadest problems. Our Government cannot assume responsibility for education until the responsibility has been passed up to it by the states and by the people, and it cannot meet its responsibility unless it has power to set up standards.

In general it may be said that a problem of education may properly be taken up by a central educational agency when there is a recognized need for a broader view and a broader comparison than can be made by the smaller educational unit. The individual medical school, for example, is buried in actual routine and is struggling with the selfish problems of support. The medical council comes to the situation with a broader view, with that freedom from bias which always results from breadth. It finds a condition in which experience with the narrow point of view and its unsatisfactory results has prepared thinking people to refer up to a central organization the problem of supervising medical education so as to bring it to a higher and better level. The council comes into possession of its problems and its authority by a process of evolution and by a natural creation of a new and higher level of responsibility.

The formula yielded by this and the earlier examples is the true formula. A problem becomes a national problem when we can devise a higher supervision and a broader form of dealing with the problem.

Unless a Federal Department of Education can be shown to be needed in order to carry on functions which the states can not now perform, there is no justification for its creation. The bill now before Congress is a curious contradiction. It demands a Federal department and then by its explicit negations makes this department powerless to even approve plans for state organization of schools. The Smith-Towner bill is a strong states rights measure. It is a very weak Federal measure.

In only one respect does the present bill magnify the Federal Government, it draws heavily on the nation's treasury. Even in the financial section, however, this bill misses the true possibilities of centralization. The Federal Government is treated as a kind of unintelligent reservoir. It is not to be a source of wisdom or of broader insight or authority. It is merely an agency to pay out cash. The bill stipulates that the states shall obey three direct orders which the law contains but after that they may go their ways. They have only to contribute their share of cash, and the simple process of national contribution to education is complete. There is in such a view no notion of raising the problem of school finance to a higher and broader level. There is no obvious recognition of what is meant by nationalizing a matter which has heretofore been a local and a state function.

In sharp contrast with such a mechanical pay-as-you-enter policy, it is the purpose of this paper to suggest a wholly different conception of the Nation's obligations in the matter of school finance. In stating this concept we may start with the patent fact that the states have failed to solve the fundamental problems involved. Our school systems have expanded at a prodigious rate and have so far outrun their incomes that many districts are today literally bankrupt. Our laws on school revenue have been tinkered until they are hopelessly involved. The various states show varying degrees of failure, but even the best of them are in dire distress. This is not a mere war emergency. The expansion of schools in the last generation has been so great that we should have been in serious difficulty by this time if there had been no war.

Take the single item of the development of high schools. Europe never dreamed of trying the experiment that we are trying in this country of offering a free high school education to all comers. It is a serious question, how we shall be able to finance our rapidly growing secondary-school system. If, for example, there should be an increase of 20 per cent or more in the attendance of our high schools in the next ten years, as there is every probability there will be, the problem of providing buildings and teachers will become very grave. The question of equitably distributing school funds so as not to cripple elementary schools will come up in acute form.

Into the present chaos of experimentation and failure in matters of school finance must be brought new wisdom and a broader view. In 1913 the Bureau of the Census made a most illuminating study of municipal expenditures with special reference to school expenditures. That study has been the surest and safest basis for the understanding of municipal school finance that has ever been laid down. Careful students and administrators have used it with eagerness and profit. There is no suggestion in that study that the Federal Government is going to pay one cent, but the study is a Federal contribution of incalculable importance made to the cities of this country.

The defect in that report is that it does not go far enough. It does not discuss the sources of school revenue with sufficient completeness to justify the formulation of any broad general policies such as would safely carry us through the present period of stress. What we need is a national educational agency which will stand outside of all the actual routine of financing schools

and will make a profound study of the matter and show states and communities what they must do.

To accomplish this the department must have the legal right to compel the states to give information if their schools are to be listed on the Nation's classified lists. It must then have sufficient equipment to deal with the information collected. After it has reached its findings it must be able to give them adequate publicity. There must be something more than the mere publication of statistical reports. This statement, I may remark, is not a reflection on the reports of the Bureau of Education. Those reports are most valuable. They are fully appreciated both here and abroad as the most complete school reports in the world. They are not adequate, however, because of the limitations on the equipment of the bureau for the service which I am advocating. My contention is that there should be a much more active communication with the people of the states regarding the financial conditions of their schools, much as there is today a complete publication of agricultural information.

The Federal Department of Education ought to have authority to go further than mere publicity. It ought to be authorized to set up certain standards. If it finds a state which is not supporting its school up to the proper limits of its ability the department ought to have the right to indicate its findings by a definite reference to its standards. This will not be possible unless the department is made strong enough to be unafraid of the politicians whom it will be compelled from time to time to offend. The law must be explicit therefore in authorizing the department to set up standards and systems of classification.

If the power to subsidize states is added to the powers which I have mentioned it should be distinctly provided that the subsidies are to be controlled by authoritative findings with regard to the extent to which states conform to standards. Federal funds should never be appropriated in a purely mechanical way and they should never be the chief end or means of Federal participation in education.

Henry Barnard long ago warned the people of Connecticut that they must be cautious or they would be corrupted by the large grant of money made by that state for the support of schools. If the state fund led them to give up their local efforts, he told them, it would have been better for them that the state fund should never have existed.

I believe the time has come when a similar warning is due to be made with regard to Federal grants and Federal participation in school affairs. There is a type of Federal support which would be calamitous. There is another type of centralized national organization which is the natural and legitimate outgrowth of our national evolution.

I believe that there is only one American way of nationalizing education. We must raise our standards to a national level. On this high level we must evolve a broader policy which shall be made possible because the states and communities have agreed to send their problem to a central agency which is equipped to devise and make operative superior forms of organization.

I am not at all certain that in the future this centralization will not lead to very large centralized financial support. It may be that the nation will come to see that equalization of opportunity or equalization of teacher training will call for Federal funds. The American way of reaching this conclusion is, I believe, to grow up to that policy. I do not believe that we have today any grounds for the assumption that financial support of the type proposed in the Smith-Towner bill is the duty of the Federal Government or that it will operate to raise standards of education. I believe that there is more danger than benefit in Federal appropriations without Federal supervision.

The concept of a Federal education department which I have tried to defend could be made clearer if we had time to discuss other examples of tasks which such a department ought to perform. I shall venture to mention three more.

The higher institutions of this country were first organized in a form which made unnecessary civil supervision. With the multiplication of such institutions and the acceptance of all sorts of standards, a situation has arisen which calls for some kind of supervision. The Department of War, for example, is quite at a loss in its educational activities to know when it is dealing with a college and when it is dealing with a private high school masquerading under the name "university." If the Department of War is confused, the ordinary citizen is completely bewildered. The country has a right to know as much about its colleges as it knows about standard grades of wheat or cotton. A Federal agency ought to undertake the task of describing the colleges of this country so that the public will know what each institution really is. A simple way of doing this, perhaps too

simple a way, is to designate those colleges which are able to prepare students far enough so that they can properly expect to take the Master's degree in one year. Two Presidents of the United States have felt it their duty to withdraw from completion and circulation lists of the type described which were prepared by the Bureau of Education. There must be an important defect in our educational outlook as a nation if we cannot face the publication of such a list. A department of education debarred from dealing with this problem will not be in any true sense a national educational agency.

Another problem might be that of accurately describing our American normal schools. Very few states have been able to make progress with this problem. Yet there is an extensive interstate commerce in the products of normal schools.

The department might devise some method of giving to the people of this country the truth about text-books. We have had in every state much restrictive legislation on an industry which has as many interstate relations as any industry in the country. There is no agency now in existence which is competent to deal with this problem, and we are without information which is essential to intelligent action.

It is the plea of many of us that the American Council on Education take steps to organize a commission which will devote much energy to a study of the tendencies which are carrying American education forward toward a national organization. It may seem wise to the Council to ask for a commission authorized by Congress. It may be that the Council will find that it can, through its own organization and because of its representative character, properly carry on for a time the investigations of national scope which are very urgently needed and which would illustrate what a Federal department ought to do.

I cannot refrain from mentioning in closing one broad problem with which we as a nation shall soon have to deal more seriously than we have in the past; it is the problem of freeing our educational system from the disastrous divisions which obstruct the student's progress from elementary school to high school and from high school to college. We have in this country the unique theory of a single continuous school system. There are threatening forces which tend to break up this continuity in new ways by introducing new kinds of schools, such as industrial schools. There are forces, too, which keep alive the traditional barriers

between the different sections of the school system. We are losing more in money and infinitely more in human life through a wasteful school organization than the Smith-Towner bill provides, and yet we have no agency strong enough to make an effective appeal to the people of the country to change in the direction of economy. The local school systems are hindered from initiating reform because their equipment and organization resist change and because their responsible officers are absorbed in routine and are reluctant to risk any innovations. State departments are so thoroughly mechanized in most states that they do not seem able to attack the problem of reorganization. Some agency far enough removed from routine to be independent of its limitation will have to take charge of the reform.

The plea which I have tried to make to the American Council on Education is for a determined attack on such broad problems as the reorganization of the system by which we finance our schools, the definition of the units which enter into our educational system, and the elimination of wasteful incoordinations within the schools themselves. It is a matter of national concern that these problems be taken up at once. Cannot this Council move in the direction of their solution? While Congress waits, cannot this representative organization which includes in its membership all the educational interests of the country take up the very problems with which the national department should deal? Would not such a move be the best possible way of showing Congress what needs to be done? Would not such a move be in the direction of the natural evolution of our American type of centralization? Would it not bring about a reorganization of the lesser units of our national school system without destroying their individuality or robbing them of their duties and functions?

CHARLES H. JUDD.

The General Staff Functions of a Federal Education Office¹

A GREAT many of the things that I had in mind to say about the Federal organization of education have already been said by the previous two speakers. I myself am fully in accord with almost everything said as furnishing a practical and coherent organization of national education. If those papers had been presented this morning we would not have been open to the charge that this discussion was entirely academic. It is much less academic to anyone who is in contact here in Washington with the practical administrative factors involved in the problem, than it is to men studying it without intimate knowledge of the intricacies of Federal administrative methods.

The fundamental thing in the discussion of this question is the general principle back of this legislation. The opponents of the Smith-Towner bill are opposed because the principles on which the bill is founded do not appear to them to be the most effective principles on which to establish a Federal organization of education. All are agreed that it is the function of the Federal Government to inspire the school system to achieve better results. The whole question is how to produce that inspiration. What can be done to inspire each local community to build up its school system, to secure better teachers and to require work that appeals to the children and really develops them.

The proposal of the Smith-Towner bill is that the necessary inspiration may be secured by offering the community a sum of money. I question very much whether that is the way to inspire an American community to action. The experiences of the war seem to demonstrate clearly that this is not the way to do it. For example, in the food campaign, American communities were not inspired by a sum of money with the idea of going without certain food staples. They were inspired to make the personal sacrifices involved because there was presented to them an ideal of service in a worthy cause. The Government did not give them money; it

¹Address delivered at the third annual meeting of the American Council on Education, May 7, 1920.

did not buy their allegiance to the food campaign or to the fuel campaign or to the support of the war workers, or to the thrift campaign. It did appeal to the imagination of the American people with an ideal that was worth while, and secured a hearty response.

This experience of the war indicates that the best way to stir the American people to action is by presenting an ideal that appeals to them as being worth while—by showing the worthiness of it through a proper campaign of enlightened information. Once this has been effectively done, the people will themselves initiate the work and pay the bills. This result is illustrated in the incident Dr. Judd has just mentioned concerning the standards for medical schools. What was the origin of their reorganization and renovation? The work was started by the Carnegie Foundation. Did they give money to the medical schools to pay for the changes? Not at all. They simply furnished the medical schools and the American public with a carefully prepared statement of the facts and conditions actually obtaining in the medical schools. These schools themselves then got busy and did the rest.

As the result of many experiences like this, it appears that the proper Federal function for education is to furnish communities with the facts as they are and with definitions of the objective standards that should be attained. If the presentation of those facts is clear and sound, the result follows without any bonus from the Federal Government.

The several private foundations that have been established to foster education have discovered by experience in the administration of large funds that they get the largest returns educationally by supplying expert advice and expert information rather than by supplying large sums of money. They require that when they give money, the institution that receives it shall be worthy of it. Therefore, they give the institution not money, but credit; and they insist that the institution shall win its credit before it gets the money.

The Smith-Towner bill proposes to give the States or the educational systems money without being sure that they achieve the credit.

Further supporting evidence for this thesis may be found in Secretary Lane's last report to the President. The day before he resigned he issued a special report to the President on his eight years of service as Secretary of the Interior. In that report he

suggests that what this country needs to improve education is a new type of national university. The institution which he outlined is very much such an institution as Mr. Judd has already described—an institution which studies national problems. It would include the institution Mr. Willoughby has presented, an institution which is a research institution to study national problems and to define objectives and to furnish information as to how those objectives may be attained; to set standards to be acquired and show how those standards may be achieved.

A further indication of the same conclusion reached after a large experience with the American people is contained in General Crowder's recent book on the "Spirit of Selective Service." General Crowder cannot be classed as an impractical idealist or theorist, as he put over one of the most magnificent administrative achievements of the war. General Crowder studied his experience carefully, and his conclusions are stated in the last few chapters of this book. He there says that the only thing that is necessary to stir the American people to action on any large issue is to appeal properly to their Americanism; to portray before them an objective or ideal that is worth while, and then to place the responsibility of achieving that objective on the local communities. That is the principle upon which he operated the draft, which everyone recognizes as a marvelous achievement in democracy under the circumstances.

It was very interesting to watch the progress of the draft here. At the beginning there was a great deal of opposition and many attempts to avoid the draft, or seek deferred classification. All this evasion disappeared before the end of the war. It became evident that the various sections of the country came to regard being drafted as more of an honor than a duty.

These various lines of evidence all seem to point to the same conclusion which has already been stated by the previous two speakers, namely, that the thing America needs as a central organization of education is an organization for research, for setting standards by defining objectives and for placing the responsibility for securing those objectives and finding the ways and means of securing them squarely upon local communities.

This type of organization may be called the General Staff organization of education because it is the plan on which the General Staff of the Army operates. The army is generally considered to be a very autocratic organization in which the

General Staff issues orders which everybody down the line carries out implicitly. As a matter of fact, this is not the case in actual practice. What the General Staff does is to define objectives and allocate responsibility for achieving them.

You can see the picture clearly if you consider a battlefield. The general on the battlefield defines certain objectives; he wants certain troops to be at a certain place at a certain time. He issues the orders, explaining to each subordinate commander that his particular function is to get a certain troop at a particular place at a particular time. That individual commander is entirely free to use any means he chooses to reach that objective. The only thing he is held responsible for is getting there at the proper time.

The same principle is recognized as sound in business organization when the board of directors defines the objectives and places the responsibility upon individuals for carrying them out. I therefore suggest as my contribution to this discussion the recognition in the Federal organization of education of the general principle that the way to get action from the American people is to define objectives which they consider to be worth while and then to incite competition between localities to see who can achieve those objectives best.

CHARLES R. MANN.

The Equivalence of French and American Degrees and Certificates

In view of the increasing number of students coming from France to American colleges and universities, the American Council on Education formed a special committee to make recommendations regarding the rating of holders of French degrees and certificates by American institutions. The recommendations prepared by the committee have been submitted to the deans of the principal graduate schools in the United States and to a number of other college and university executives. For the most part they have been approved as offering a reasonable working basis. The officers of three institutions have commented unfavorably upon them. Since the report seems to have met with the approval of the majority of university officers consulted, the Council now publishes it for the convenience of American institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ADMISSION OF HOLDERS OF FRENCH DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES TO GRADUATE STUDY AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

1. That the French "licence" be accepted as the equivalent of the American M. A. degree.
2. That holders of the Baccalaureate who produce evidence of having done one year of graduate study in a French university be admitted to graduate standing.
3. That holders of the Baccalaureate be admitted for one year as "unclassified students" and if they prove their fitness, be then admitted to graduate standing.
4. With regard to engineering, medical and other professional degrees, no recommendation is made, as each case must be dealt with on a comparison of the studies required with those already taken. The Office National des Universités et Ecoles Françaises, 411 West 117th Street, New York City, holds itself in readiness, however, to offer information promptly in case of difficulty.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ADMISSION OF HOLDERS OF THE FRENCH A. B. TO UNDERGRADUATE STANDING IN AMERICAN COLLEGES

It is assumed that the terms of admission to graduate and to undergraduate standing will be different. In the case of the graduate student, the important

question is whether he is sufficiently prepared, or of sufficient intellectual maturity to be able to pursue advanced work in his special field of study acceptable to the university authorities. The candidate for the bachelor's degree at most American institutions, on the other hand, must meet certain general quantitative requirements and must have completed definite amounts of certain prescribed subjects. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that the holders of the French Baccalaureate who become candidates for the A. B. at American institutions will be less generously rated than those who seek opportunities to undertake advanced study.

The Committee suggests that the holder of the French A. B. who enters an American college as a candidate for the bachelor's degree be admitted to that class, or to those courses that the record of his previous studies indicates he is qualified to enter, with due regard to the special graduation requirements of the college and to his knowledge of the English language. It is recommended that no French student be allowed to major in a study or group of studies in which he has not majored in his lycée course. In giving academic rating to holders of the French Baccalaureate, American college officers will naturally take into account the greater intensity of French secondary education, the consequent early intellectual maturity of French young men and women, and the fact that those who secure the Baccalaureate have been subjected to a series of searching examinations that have eliminated a large percentage of the candidates.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ADMISSION OF AMERICAN DEGREE HOLDERS TO GRADUATE STUDY AT FRENCH UNIVERSITIES

As the French universities already admit to graduate study any one who holds a bachelor's degree from an accredited American college, there seems no need to recommend reciprocal action to the French Minister of Education, but the Office National des Universités et Ecoles Françaises will probably be able to secure additional privileges for students who hold the M. A. and are formally certified by the dean of their graduate school or other competent university official as capable of conducting research, with a view to proceeding to the French doctorate. However, it is expected that more definite proposals will later be made concerning American students at French universities.

No provision is suggested for French or American students who have not taken the A. B., as such cases of interchange will be, and perhaps ought to be, exceptional.

American Council on Education

THE ANNUAL MEETING

The Third Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education was held in Washington, D. C., May 7 and 8, 1920. The business meeting was preceded by a conference on The Participation of the Federal Government in Education. The addresses printed on pages 91 to 104 and 107 to 135 were delivered at this conference. President Hadley's letter on pages 105 and 106 was submitted to be read. In the following issue of the RECORD the business transactions of the Council at the annual meeting will be reported.

THE COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE PLACE AND FUNCTION OF FACULTIES IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

In the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors for March, 1920, appears a noteworthy report of Committee T on the Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration. Copies of this report may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association, Professor H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, at twenty-five cents each or at ten cents per copy for six or more.

CORRECTION

In the Educational Record, Volume One, Number One, page thirty-seven, under the caption "Institutional Members," Wheaton College appearing under Illinois should have appeared under Massachusetts.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR AMERICAN MEN IN FRENCH UNIVERSITIES

The Council has received from the French Department of Education and the Office National des Universités Françaises, in appreciation of the scholarships awarded to French students in

America, an offer of sixteen graduate scholarships and fellowships, ten at the University of Bordeaux, and six at the University of Toulouse. The scholarships and fellowships are open to men under thirty who are graduates of an accredited college or university and who have a fair knowledge of French.

The ten Bordeaux scholarships carry free tuition and probably residence. The subjects recommended for study are political science and law, history, geography, tropical diseases, French language and literature.

At Toulouse a bourse of 3,000 francs in addition to free tuition is offered to a student in chemical research under Professor Paul Sabatier. An additional scholarship, carrying free tuition and probably residence is offered in each of the following Institutes:

1. Chemistry.
2. Electrical Engineering.
3. Agriculture.
4. Hydrology (for Doctors interested in medicinal waters).
5. Provençal and Romance Philology.

The selection of candidates for these scholarships and fellowships is in charge of the Council's committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships. The assignments will probably be made early in July.